arXiv:math/0510017v1 [math.QA] 2 Oct 2005

Crystal structure of the set of Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths of a level-zero shape for an affine Lie algebra

Satoshi Naito
Institute of Mathematics, University of Tsukuba,
Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8571, Japan (e-mail: `naito@math.tsukuba.ac.jp`)

and

Daisuke Sagaki
Institute of Mathematics, University of Tsukuba,
Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8571, Japan (e-mail: `sagaki@math.tsukuba.ac.jp`)

Abstract

Let $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ for $i \in I_0$, be a level-zero dominant integral weight for an affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$, where the ϖ_i, $i \in I_0$, are the level-zero fundamental weights, and let $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ be the crystal of all Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths of shape λ. First, we give an explicit description of the decomposition of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ into a disjoint union of connected components, and show that all the connected components are pairwise "isomorphic" (up to a shift of weights). Second, we "realize" the connected component $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ containing the straight line π_λ as a specified subcrystal of the affinization $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ (with weight lattice P) of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}} \simeq \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \bigl(\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}\bigr)^{\otimes m_i}$ (with weight lattice $P_{\mathrm{cl}} = P/(\mathbb{Q}\delta \cap P)$, where δ is the null root of $\mathfrak{g}$), which was studied in a previous paper [NS3].

1 Introduction.

Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths (LS paths for short) and root operators acting on them for a Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over the field $\mathbb{Q}$ were introduced by Littelmann in [L1], [L2], and it was proved independently by Kashiwara [Kas2] and Joseph [J] that if λ is a dominant integral weight, then the set (or rather, crystal) $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ of all LS paths of shape λ is isomorphic as a crystal to the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ of the irreducible highest weight module $V(\lambda)$ of highest weight λ over the quantized universal enveloping algebra (quantum affine algebra) $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ over the field $\mathbb{Q}(q)$. But, the crystal structure of the set $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ of all LS paths of shape λ for a general integral weight $\lambda \in P$ remained unknown. The purpose of this paper is to study the crystal structure of this $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ in the case that $\mathfrak{g}$ is an affine Lie algebra.

Let us describe our results more explicitly. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be an affine Lie algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ with Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$, simple roots $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, simple coroots $\{h_j\}_{j \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}$, and Weyl group $W \subset \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$. We denote by $\delta = \sum_{j \in I} a_j \alpha_j \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ the null root, and by $c = \sum_{j \in I} a_j^{\vee} h_j \in \mathfrak{h}$ the canonical central element. Note that in the case of an affine Lie algebra, an integral weight $\lambda \in P$ is of positive level (i.e., $\lambda(c) > 0$), of negative level (i.e., $\lambda(c) < 0$), or of level zero (i.e., $\lambda(c) = 0$). If $\lambda \in P$ is of positive (resp., negative) level, then λ is equivalent, under the Weyl group W of $\mathfrak{g}$, to a dominant (resp., antidominant) integral weight $\Lambda \in P$, and hence the $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) = \mathbb{B}(\Lambda)$ (see Remark 2.6.2 (3)) is isomorphic as a crystal to the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda)$ of the irreducible highest (resp., lowest) weight module of highest (resp., lowest) weight Λ over the quantum affine algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Thus it remains to consider the case in which λ is of level zero, and hence (by Remark 2.6.2 (3) and Lemma 2.7.4) level-zero dominant, i.e., of the following form: $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in I_0$, where the ϖ_i, $i \in I_0 := I \setminus \{0\}$, are the level-zero fundamental weights for the affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$.

In previous papers [NS1], [NS2], we proved that for each $i \in I_0$, the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)$ of all LS paths of shape ϖ_i is connected, and also proved that this crystal $\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)$ is isomorphic to the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\varpi_i)$ of the extremal weight module $V(\varpi_i)$ of extremal weight ϖ_i over $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, introduced by Kashiwara [Kas1], [Kas3] in a more general setting. Furthermore, in [NS2], we obtained an explicit description of the decomposition of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(m\varpi_i)$ of all LS paths of shape $m\varpi_i$, with $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, into a disjoint union of connected components, and then proved that also for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, this crystal $\mathbb{B}(m\varpi_i)$ is isomorphic to the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(m\varpi_i)$ of the extremal weight module $V(m\varpi_i)$ of extremal weight $m\varpi_i$. Therefore, it seems natural to expect that for an arbitrary level-zero dominant integral weight $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in I_0$, the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ of the extremal weight module $V(\lambda)$ of extremal weight λ. However, this is not true even for the (simple) case in which $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_2^{(1)}$ and $\lambda = \varpi_1 + \varpi_2$, as can be seen from [NS3, Example 4.1] (and [NS1, Remark 5.2]). In fact, the crystals $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ are isomorphic only if $\lambda = m_i \varpi_i$ for some $i \in I_0$ and $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ (see Appendix).

In this paper, we give an explicit description (Theorem 3.1.1) of the decomposition of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ of all LS paths of shape λ into a disjoint union of connected components, where $\lambda \in P$ is an arbitrary level-zero dominant integral weight of the form $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in I_0$. Namely, we prove that each connected component of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ contains exactly one (extremal) LS path having an expression of the form (3.1.4), and that the set of all extremal LS paths in each connected component of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ coincides with the W-orbit of an (extremal) LS path having an expression of the form (3.1.4). A key to the proof of Theorem 3.1.1 is one of main results of a previous paper [NS3] (see Theorem 2.6.6) that the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ with weight lattice P_{cl} is "simple", and hence connected. Here the lattice P_{cl} is equal to $P/(\mathbb{Q}\delta \cap P)$, and $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is a crystal with weight lattice P_{cl} (which we call a P_{cl}-crystal) obtained from the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ with weight lattice P (which we call a P-crystal) as follows: $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}} = \bigl\{\mathrm{cl}(\pi) \mid \pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)\bigr\}$, where $(\mathrm{cl}(\pi))(t) \in P_{\mathrm{cl}}$ for $t \in [0,1]$ is defined to be the image $\mathrm{cl}(\pi(t))$ of $\pi(t)$ under the canonical projection $\mathrm{cl} : \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P_{\mathrm{cl}}$.

It immediately follows from Theorem 3.1.1, along with Lemma 2.7.1, that the connected components of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ are pairwise "isomorphic" (up to a shift of weights), like the case of the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ of the extremal weight module $V(\lambda)$ of extremal weight λ (see [BN, Theorem 4.15]). Hence it suffices to study the crystal structure of the connected component $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ containing the straight line π_λ, which is obviously an extremal LS path having an expression of the form (3.1.4). For this purpose, generalizing [GL, Proposition 5.9] for the case in which $\lambda = m_i\varpi_i$, with $i \in I_0$ and $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, to the case of the level-zero dominant integral weight $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i\varpi_i$, we introduce the "affinization" $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ (which is a P-crystal) of the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$, and prove that the affinization $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ is isomorphic as a P-crystal to a disjoint union of connected components of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, including $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ (see Theorem 4.2.2). Furthermore, we give a condition (condition (C) of Corollary 4.2.7) for an element of the affinization $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ to lie in the isomorphic image of the connected component $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, which enables us to identify $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ with a specified subcrystal of $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$. Here we recall from [NS2] and [NS3] (see Theorem 2.6.6 and the comments just below it) that the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is isomorphic to the tensor product $\bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \bigl(\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}\bigr)^{\otimes m_i}$ of the P_{cl}-crystals $\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}$, $i \in I_0$, and that for each $i \in I_0$, the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is isomorphic to the crystal base of the level-zero fundamental module $W(\varpi_i)$ over the quantized universal enveloping algebra $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ with weight lattice P_{cl}, which is introduced by Kashiwara in [Kas3]. Thus, our results in this paper, together with this description of the P_{cl}-crystal structure of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$, completely determine the P-crystal structure of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ for an arbitrary level-zero dominant integral weight $\lambda \in P$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we fix our notation, and recall some basic facts concerning affine Lie algebras and crystals of all LS paths. In addition, we briefly review our results about the crystal structure of the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ for a level-zero dominant integral weight $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i\varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in I_0$. In

Section 3, we give an explicit description (Theorem 3.1.1) of the decomposition of the P-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ into connected components for the $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$ above. In Section 4, we study the decomposition of the affinization $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ into connected components (Theorem 4.2.2), and then obtain a condition (Corollary 4.2.7) for an element of $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ to lie in (the isomorphic image of) the connected component $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

2 Preliminaries.

2.1 Affine Lie algebras and quantum affine algebras. Let $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ be a generalized Cartan matrix of affine type. Throughout this paper, we assume that the elements of the index set I are numbered as in [Kac, Section 4.8, Tables Aff 1 – Aff 3]. Take a special vertex $0 \in I$ as in these tables, and set $I_0 := I \setminus \{0\}$. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A)$ be the affine Lie algebra associated to the Cartan matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ of affine type over the field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers, and let $\mathfrak{h}$ be its Cartan subalgebra. If we denote by $\Pi^{\vee} := \{h_j\}_{j \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ the set of the simple coroots, and by $d \in \mathfrak{h}$ the scaling element, then we have $\mathfrak{h} = \left(\bigoplus_{j \in I} \mathbb{Q} h_j\right) \oplus \mathbb{Q} d$. Also, we denote by $\Pi := \{\alpha_j\}_{j \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}^* := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbb{Q})$ the set of the simple roots, and by $\Lambda_j \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $j \in I$, the fundamental weights; note that $\alpha_j(d) = \delta_{j,0}$ and $\Lambda_j(d) = 0$ for all $j \in I$ (see [Kac, Section 6.1] and [HK, Section 10.1]). Let

$$\delta = \sum_{j \in I} a_j \alpha_j \in \mathfrak{h}^* \qquad \text{and} \qquad c = \sum_{j \in I} a_j^{\vee} h_j \in \mathfrak{h} \tag{2.1.1}$$

be the null root and the canonical central element of $\mathfrak{g}$, respectively. Here we should note that

$$a_0 = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2\ell}^{(2)}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.1.2}$$

We define the Weyl group W of $\mathfrak{g}$ by: $W = \langle r_j \mid j \in I \rangle \subset \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$, where $r_j \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ is the simple reflection associated to α_j for $j \in I$, and then define the set Δ^{re} of real roots by: $\Delta^{\mathrm{re}} = W\Pi$. The set of positive real roots is denoted by $\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}} \subset \Delta^{\mathrm{re}}$. Also, let us denote by $(\cdot\,,\,\cdot)$ the (standard) bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ normalized as in [Kac, Section 6.2]; we have $(\alpha_j, \alpha_j) = 2a_j^{\vee} a_j^{-1}$ for all $j \in I$.

We take a dual weight lattice $P^{\vee}$ and a weight lattice P as follows:

$$P^{\vee} = \left(\bigoplus_{j \in I} \mathbb{Z} h_j\right) \oplus \mathbb{Z} d \subset \mathfrak{h} \quad \text{and} \quad P = \left(\bigoplus_{j \in I} \mathbb{Z} \Lambda_j\right) \oplus \mathbb{Z} a_0^{-1} \delta \subset \mathfrak{h}^*. \tag{2.1.3}$$

It is easily seen that $P \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P^{\vee}, \mathbb{Z})$. The quintuplet $(A, P, P^{\vee}, \Pi, \Pi^{\vee})$ is called a Cartan datum for the generalized Cartan matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ of affine type (see [HK, Definition 2.1]).

Let $\mathrm{cl} : \mathfrak{h}^* \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*/\mathbb{Q}\delta$ be the canonical projection from $\mathfrak{h}^*$ onto $\mathfrak{h}^*/\mathbb{Q}\delta$, and define the classical weight lattice P_{cl} and the dual weight lattice $P^\vee_{\mathrm{cl}}$ by:

$$P_{\mathrm{cl}} = \mathrm{cl}(P) = \bigoplus_{j\in I} \mathbb{Z}\,\mathrm{cl}(\Lambda_j) \quad \text{and} \quad P^\vee_{\mathrm{cl}} = \bigoplus_{j\in I} \mathbb{Z}h_j \subset P^\vee. \tag{2.1.4}$$

Note that $P_{\mathrm{cl}} \simeq P/(\mathbb{Q}\delta \cap P)$, and that P_{cl} can be identified with $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P^\vee_{\mathrm{cl}}, \mathbb{Z})$ as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module by: $(\mathrm{cl}(\lambda))(h) = \lambda(h)$ for $\lambda \in P$ and $h \in P^\vee_{\mathrm{cl}}$. The quintuple $(A, \mathrm{cl}(\Pi), \Pi^\vee, P_{\mathrm{cl}}, P^\vee_{\mathrm{cl}})$ is called a classical Cartan datum (see [HK, Section 10.1]).

We set

$$\mathring{\Delta} := \Delta^{\mathrm{re}} \cap \sum_{j\in I_0} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j, \qquad \mathring{\Delta}_+ := \Delta^{\mathrm{re}}_+ \cap \sum_{j\in I_0} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j, \tag{2.1.5}$$

$$\mathring{\Pi} := \{\alpha_j\}_{j\in I_0} \subset \Pi, \qquad \mathring{W} := \langle r_j \mid j \in I_0 \rangle \subset W. \tag{2.1.6}$$

Note that $\mathring{\Delta} = \mathring{W}\mathring{\Pi}$. In this paper, we call a root $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}$ a long (resp., short) root in $\mathring{\Delta}$ if $(\beta, \beta) \geq (\gamma, \gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathring{\Delta}$ (resp., otherwise). For each $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}$, we set

$$c_\beta := \max\left\{1, \frac{(\beta, \beta)}{2}\right\}. \tag{2.1.7}$$

Note that $c_{w\beta} = c_\beta$ for all $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}$ and $w \in \mathring{W}$, since the bilinear form $(\cdot\,,\,\cdot)$ on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ is W-invariant.

Remark 2.1.1. By direct computation, we obtain the following:

(1) If $\mathfrak{g}$ is nontwisted, then $(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/2 = 1$ for every long simple root $\alpha_j \in \mathring{\Pi}$, and $(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/2$ is equal to $1/3$, $1/2$, or 1 for each $j \in I_0$. Therefore, we have $c_{\alpha_j} = 1$ for all $j \in I_0$, and hence $c_\beta = 1$ for all $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}$.

(2) If $\mathfrak{g}$ is twisted, then $(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/2 = 1$ for every short simple root $\alpha_j \in \mathring{\Pi}$, and $(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/2$ is equal to 1, 2, or 3 for each $j \in I_0$. Therefore, we have $c_{\alpha_j} = (\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/2$ for all $j \in I_0$, and hence for each $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}$,

$$c_\beta = \frac{(\beta, \beta)}{2} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \beta \text{ is a short root in } \mathring{\Delta}, \\ 2 \text{ or } 3 & \text{if } \beta \text{ is a long root in } \mathring{\Delta}. \end{cases}$$

For $j \in I_0$, we set

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_j := \begin{cases} \alpha_j & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is twisted, and not of type } A^{(2)}_{2\ell}, \\ \dfrac{2\alpha_j}{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{2.1.8}$$

and $\Gamma := \sum_{j \in I_0} \mathbb{Z}\widetilde{\alpha}_j$ (see [Kac, (6.5.8)]). For $\beta \in \Gamma$, we denote by $t_\beta \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ the translation of $\mathfrak{h}^*$ with respect to β (see [Kac, (6.5.2)]). We know from [Kac, (6.5.6)] that $T := \bigl\{ t_\beta \mid \beta \in \Gamma \bigr\}$ is an abelian group, and from [Kac, Proposition 6.5] that the Weyl group W of $\mathfrak{g}$ decomposes into the semidirect product $\overset{\circ}{W} \ltimes T$ of the Weyl group $\overset{\circ}{W}$ (of finite type) and the group T of translations.

2.2 Real roots of an affine Lie algebra and their finite parts.

The following proposition immediately follows from [Kac, Proposition 6.3] and Remark 2.1.1.

Proposition 2.2.1. (1) *If $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$, then* $\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}} = \bigl\{ \beta + nc_\beta\delta \mid \beta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+,\ n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \bigr\} \cup \bigl\{ -\beta + nc_\beta\delta \mid \beta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+,\ n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1} \bigr\}$.

(2) *If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}} = \ & \bigl\{ \beta + nc_\beta\delta \mid \beta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+,\ n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \bigr\} \cup \bigl\{ -\beta + nc_\beta\delta \mid \beta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+,\ n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1} \bigr\} \cup \\ & \bigl\{ \tfrac{1}{2}\bigl(\beta + (2n-1)\delta\bigr) \mid \beta \text{ is a long root in } \overset{\circ}{\Delta},\ n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1} \bigr\}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2.2. For $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$, we define the finite part $\overline{\xi} \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$ of ξ as follows:

(1) If ξ is of the form $\xi = \beta + nc_\beta\delta$ with $\beta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$, then we set $\overline{\xi} := \mathrm{sgn}(\beta)\beta$, where $\mathrm{sgn}(\beta) := 1$ if $\beta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$, and $\mathrm{sgn}(\beta) := -1$ if $\beta \in -\overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$.

(2) If ξ is of the form $\xi = \frac{1}{2}(\beta + (2n-1)\delta)$ with $\beta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1}$, then we set $\overline{\xi} := \mathrm{sgn}(\beta)\beta$.

2.3 Level-zero integral weights.

Definition 2.3.1. An integral weight $\lambda \in P$ is said to be level zero if $\lambda(c) = 0$. An integral weight $\lambda \in P$ of level zero is said to be level-zero dominant if $\lambda(h_j) \ge 0$ for all $j \in I_0$.

For each $i \in I_0$, we define a level-zero fundamental weight $\varpi_i \in P$ by: $\varpi_i = \Lambda_i - a_i^\vee \Lambda_0$, and $d_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by:

$$d_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2\ell}^{(2)} \text{ and } i = \ell, \\ c_{\alpha_i} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.3.1}$$

Lemma 2.3.2. *Let $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ for $i \in I_0$, be a level-zero dominant integral weight. Then,* $T\lambda = \lambda + \bigl(\sum_{i \in I_0} m_i d_i \mathbb{Z} \bigr)\delta$.

Proof. We deduce from Remark 2.1.1 and the definition (2.3.1) of d_i that $(\varpi_i, \widetilde{\alpha}_j) = \delta_{ij} d_i$ for all i, $j \in I_0$. Since λ is level-zero, it follows from [Kac, (6.5.5)] that $t_\beta\lambda = \lambda - (\lambda, \beta)\delta$

for all $\beta \in \Gamma$. Therefore, we have

$$T\lambda = \lambda + (\lambda, \Gamma)\delta = \lambda + \left(\sum_{j \in I_0} (\lambda, \widetilde{\alpha}_j)\mathbb{Z} \right) \delta$$

$$= \lambda + \left(\sum_{i,j \in I_0} m_i(\varpi_i, \widetilde{\alpha}_j)\mathbb{Z} \right) \delta = \lambda - \left(\sum_{i \in I_0} m_i d_i \mathbb{Z} \right) \delta.$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 2.3.3. *Let $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in I_0$, be a level-zero dominant integral weight. Then we have $W\lambda \subset \lambda - \mathring{Q}_+ + \mathbb{Z}\delta$, where $\mathring{Q}_+ := \sum_{j \in I_0} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_j$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} W\lambda &= \mathring{W} T\lambda \subset \mathring{W}(\lambda + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \quad \text{by Lemma 2.3.2} \\ &= \mathring{W}\lambda + \mathbb{Z}\delta \subset \lambda - \mathring{Q}_+ + \mathbb{Z}\delta \quad \text{since } \lambda \text{ is level-zero dominant.} \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

For a real root $\beta \in \Delta^{\mathrm{re}}$, let $\beta^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}$ denote its dual root. The proof of the following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 2.3.4. (1) *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of the form $\xi = \beta + nc_\beta\delta$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $\nu \in P$ be a level-zero integral weight. Then, $\nu(\xi^\vee) = \nu(\beta^\vee)$, and $r_\xi(\nu) = \nu - \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta - \nu(\beta^\vee)nc_\beta\delta$.*
(2) *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of the form $\xi = \frac{1}{2}(\beta + (2n-1)\delta)$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $\nu \in P$ be a level-zero integral weight. Then, $\nu(\xi^\vee) = 2\nu(\beta^\vee)$, and $r_\xi(\nu) = \nu - \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta - \nu(\beta^\vee)(2n-1)\delta$.*

2.4 Definition of σ-chains.

Definition 2.4.1. Let μ, $\nu \in P$ be integral weights. We write $\mu > \nu$ if there exist a sequence $\mu = \nu_0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_k = \nu$ of integral weights and a sequence $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k$ of positive real roots such that $\nu_l = r_{\xi_l}(\nu_{l-1})$ and $\nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for $1 \leq l \leq k$ (we write $\mu \geq \nu$ if $\mu > \nu$ or $\mu = \nu$). In this case, the sequence $\nu_0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_k$ above is called a chain for (μ, ν). If $\mu > \nu$, then we define $\mathrm{dist}(\mu, \nu)$ to be the maximum length k of all possible chains for (μ, ν).

Remark 2.4.2. Let $\mu,\, \nu \in P$ be integral weights such that $\mu > \nu$. Let $\mu = \nu_0,\, \nu_1,\, \dots,\, \nu_k = \nu$ be a chain for (μ, ν), and assume that both $\xi_1,\, \dots,\, \xi_k$ and $\zeta_1,\, \dots,\, \zeta_k$ are sequences of positive real roots corresponding to the chain $\mu = \nu_0,\, \nu_1,\, \dots,\, \nu_k = \nu$. Then it immediately follows from [NS2, Lemma 2.1.4] that $\xi_l = \zeta_l$ for all $1 \le l \le k$. Thus, a sequence of positive real roots corresponding to each chain is uniquely determined.

Remark 2.4.3. (1) Let $\mu,\, \nu \in P$ be integral weights such that $\mu > \nu$. Assume that $\mu = \nu_0,\, \nu_1,\, \dots,\, \nu_k = \nu$ is a chain for (μ, ν), with $\xi_1,\, \dots,\, \xi_k$ the corresponding positive real roots. Then it follows that $\nu - \mu \in \sum_{l=1}^{k} \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\xi_l$. In particular, $\nu - \mu \in Q_+ \setminus \{0\}$, where $Q_+ := \sum_{j \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}\alpha_j$.

(2) Let $\mu \in P$, and assume that $\mu(h_j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for some $j \in I$. Then we have $\mu > r_j(\mu)$. Furthermore, it immediately follows from part (1) that $\mathrm{dist}(\mu,\, r_j(\mu)) = 1$. Indeed, assume that $\mathrm{dist}(\mu,\, r_j(\mu)) = k$, and let $\xi_1,\, \dots,\, \xi_k$ be the positive real roots corresponding to a chain of the maximum length. Then, by part (1), we have $-\mu(h_j)\alpha_j = r_j(\mu) - \mu \in -\mu(\xi_1^\vee)\xi_1 + \sum_{l=2}^{k} \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\xi_l$. Therefore, from the linearly independence of the simple roots, we obtain that $\xi_l = \alpha_j$ for all $1 \le l \le k$. Hence we have $k = 1$, since $\xi_1 = \alpha_j$ implies $\xi_1^\vee = h_j$.

Lemma 2.4.4. *Let $\mu,\, \nu \in P$ be level-zero integral weights. Assume that $\mu > \nu$ and $\mathrm{dist}(\mu, \nu) = 1$, and let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be the corresponding positive real root. Then, ξ is one of the following forms: $\xi = \beta$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, $\xi = -\beta + c_\beta\delta$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, or $\xi = \frac{1}{2}(-\beta + \delta)$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$.*

Proof. First, suppose that $\xi = \beta + nc_\beta\delta$ for some $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1}$. Then we see from Proposition 2.2.1 that $\xi' := -\beta + nc_\beta\delta$ is a positive real root. By simple computations (using Lemma 2.3.4), we can easily verify that

$$\nu_0 := \mu, \quad \nu_1 := r_\beta(\mu), \quad \nu_2 := r_{\xi'}r_\beta(\mu), \quad \nu_3 := r_\beta r_{\xi'} r_\beta(\mu) = \nu$$

is a chain for $(\mu,\, \nu)$. Hence we have $\mathrm{dist}(\mu, \nu) \ge 3$, which is a contradiction.

Now, suppose that $\xi = -\beta + nc_\beta\delta$ for some $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 2}$. Then we see from Proposition 2.2.1 that $\xi' := \beta + (n-2)c_\beta\delta$ and $\xi'' := -\beta + c_\beta\delta$ are positive real roots. By simple computations (using Lemma 2.3.4), we can easily verify that

$$\nu_0 := \mu, \quad \nu_1 := r_{\xi''}(\mu), \quad \nu_2 := r_{\xi'}r_{\xi''}(\mu), \quad \nu_3 := r_{\xi''}r_{\xi'}r_{\xi''}(\mu) = \nu$$

is a chain for $(\mu,\, \nu)$. Hence we have $\mathrm{dist}(\mu, \nu) \ge 3$, which is a contradiction.

Now, suppose that $\xi = \frac{1}{2}\bigl(\beta + (2n-1)\delta\bigr)$ for some $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1}$; note that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$. Then we see from Proposition 2.2.1 (2) that $\xi' := \frac{1}{2}\bigl(-\beta + (2n-1)\delta\bigr)$ is a positive real root. By simple computations (using Lemma 2.3.4), we can easily verify that

$$\nu_0 := \mu, \quad \nu_1 := r_\beta(\mu), \quad \nu_2 := r_{\xi'} r_\beta(\mu), \quad \nu_3 := r_\beta r_{\xi'} r_\beta(\mu) = \nu$$

is a chain for (μ, ν). Hence we have $\mathrm{dist}(\mu, \nu) \geq 3$, which is a contradiction.

Finally, suppose that $\xi = \frac{1}{2}\bigl(-\beta + (2n-1)\delta\bigr)$ for some $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$; note that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$. Then we see from Proposition 2.2.1 (2) that $\xi' := \frac{1}{2}\bigl(\beta + (2n-3)\delta\bigr)$ and $\xi'' := \frac{1}{2}\bigl(-\beta + \delta\bigr)$ are positive real roots. By simple computations (using Lemma 2.3.4), we can easily verify that

$$\nu_0 := \mu, \quad \nu_1 := r_{\xi''}(\mu), \quad \nu_2 := r_{\xi'} r_{\xi''}(\mu), \quad \nu_3 := r_{\xi''} r_{\xi'} r_{\xi''}(\mu) = \nu$$

is a chain for (μ, ν). Hence we have $\mathrm{dist}(\mu, \nu) \geq 3$, which is a contradiction. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Definition 2.4.5. Let $\mu, \nu \in P$ be integral weights such that $\mu \geq \nu$, and let $0 < \sigma < 1$ be a rational number. A σ-chain for (μ, ν) is, by definition, a sequence $\mu = \nu_0 > \nu_1 > \cdots > \nu_k = \nu$ of integral weights satisfying either of the following conditions:

(1) $k = 0$ and $\mu = \nu_0 = \nu$, or

(2) $k \geq 1$, and $\mathrm{dist}(\nu_{l-1}, \nu_l) = 1$ and $\nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee) \in \sigma^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for every $1 \leq l \leq k$, where ξ_l is the positive real root corresponding to the chain for (ν_{l-1}, ν_l), $1 \leq l \leq k$.

Using the fact that $\delta(\beta^\vee) = 0$ for all $\beta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$, we can easily derive the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4.6. *Let $\mu, \nu \in P$ be integral weights such that $\mu \geq \nu$, and let $0 < \sigma < 1$ be a rational number. If there exists a σ-chain for (μ, ν), then there also exists a σ-chain for $(\mu + n\delta,\ \nu + n\delta)$ for each $n \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$.*

2.5 Path crystals with weight lattice P, or P_{cl}.

A path with weight in P is, by definition, a piecewise linear, continuous map $\pi : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P$ from $[0, 1] := \bigl\{t \in \mathbb{Q} \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\bigr\}$ to $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P$ such that $\pi(0) = 0$ and $\pi(1) \in P$. We denote by $\mathbb{P}$ the set of all paths $\pi : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P$ with weight in P. For two paths $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathbb{P}$, we define $\pi_1 \pm \pi_2 \in \mathbb{P}$ by: $(\pi_1 \pm \pi_2)(t) = \pi_1(t) \pm \pi_2(t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$.

Definition 2.5.1. Let $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ be a path with weight in P. A pair $(\underline{\nu}\,;\, \underline{\sigma})$ of a sequence $\underline{\nu} : \nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_s$ of integral weights and a sequence $\underline{\sigma} : 0 = \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \cdots < \sigma_s = 1$ of rational numbers is called an expression of π if the following equation

$$\pi(t) = \sum_{u'=1}^{u-1} (\sigma_{u'} - \sigma_{u'-1})\nu_{u'} + (t - \sigma_{u-1})\nu_u \quad \text{for all} \quad \sigma_{u-1} \leq t \leq \sigma_u,\ 1 \leq u \leq s, \tag{2.5.1}$$

holds. If $(\underline{\nu}\,;\,\underline{\sigma})$ is an expression of a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, then we write $\pi = (\underline{\nu}\,;\,\underline{\sigma})$.

Remark 2.5.2. An expression for a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ is uniquely determined, up to the following two operations:

(1) Let $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_s\,;\, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s)$ be an expression of a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$. If $\nu_u = \nu_{u+1}$ for some $0 \le u \le s-1$, then we can "omit" ν_u and σ_u from this expression of π. For example, if $\pi = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3\,;\, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ and $\nu_2 = \nu_3$, then $(\nu_1, \nu_3\,;\, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_3)$ is also an expression of π, i.e., $\pi = (\nu_1, \nu_3\,;\, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_3)$.

(2) Let $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_s\,;\, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s)$ be an expression of a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$. If $\sigma_u < \tau < \sigma_{u+1}$ for some $0 \le u \le s-1$, then we can "insert" τ into this expression of π. For example, if $\pi = (\nu_1, \nu_2\,;\, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ and $\sigma_0 < \tau < \sigma_1$, then $(\nu_1, \nu_1, \nu_2\,;\, \sigma_0, \tau, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ is also an expression of π, i.e., $\pi = (\nu_1, \nu_1, \nu_2\,;\, \sigma_0, \tau, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)$.

For an integral weight $\nu \in P$, let us denote by π_ν the straight line connecting $0 \in P$ with $\nu \in P$, i.e., $\pi_\nu(t) := t\nu$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Note that π_ν has an expression of the form:

$$\pi_\nu = (\underbrace{\nu, \nu, \ldots, \nu}_{s \text{ times}}\,;\, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s) \tag{2.5.2}$$

for each $0 = \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \cdots < \sigma_s = 1$.

For each $j \in I$, we denote by $e_j,\ f_j : \mathbb{P} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\} \to \mathbb{P} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ the root operators corresponding to the simple root α_j, which are introduced in [L2, Section 1] (see also [NS2, Section 1.2] for an explicit description of e_j and f_j). Here the $\mathbf{0}$ is an additional element corresponding to the 0 in the theory of crystals. For each $j \in I$, we define $S_j : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{P}$ by:

$$S_j \pi = \begin{cases} f_j^n \pi & \text{if } n = (\pi(1))(h_j) \ge 0, \\ e_j^{-n} \pi & \text{if } n = (\pi(1))(h_j) < 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.5.3}$$

for $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$. We know from [L2, Theorem 8.1] that there exists a unique action $S : W \to \mathrm{Bij}(\mathbb{P})$, $w \mapsto S_w$, of the Weyl group W on the set $\mathbb{P}$ of all paths such that $S_{r_j} = S_j$ for all $j \in I$, where $\mathrm{Bij}(\mathbb{P})$ denotes the group of all bijections from the set $\mathbb{P}$ to itself; if $w \in W$ equals $r_{i_1} r_{i_2} \cdots r_{j_l}$ for some $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_l \in I$, then $S_w = S_{j_1} S_{j_2} \cdots S_{j_l}$. Note that we have $(S_w \pi)(1) = w(\pi(1))$ for all $w \in W$ and $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$. Moreover, we know from [GL, Lemma 5.2] that

$$S_w \pi_\nu = \pi_{w\nu} \quad \text{for } \nu \in P \text{ and } w \in W. \tag{2.5.4}$$

Definition 2.5.3. A path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ is said to be extremal if for every $w \in W$, either $e_j S_w \pi = \mathbf{0}$ or $f_j S_w \pi = \mathbf{0}$ holds for each $j \in I$.

Remark 2.5.4. We can easily deduce from (2.5.4) and the definition of an extremal path that for every $\nu \in P$, the straight line $\pi_\nu \in \mathbb{P}$ is an extremal path.

A path with weight in P_{cl} is, by definition, a piecewise linear, continuous map $\eta : [0,1] \to \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P_{\mathrm{cl}}$ from $[0,1] = \bigl\{t \in \mathbb{Q} \mid 0 \le t \le 1\bigr\}$ to $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P_{\mathrm{cl}}$ such that $\eta(0) = 0$ and $\eta(1) \in P_{\mathrm{cl}}$. We denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ the set of all paths $\eta : [0,1] \to \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P_{\mathrm{cl}}$ with weight in P_{cl}. For $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$, we define a path $\mathrm{cl}(\pi) \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ by: $(\mathrm{cl}(\pi))(t) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi(t))$ for $t \in [0,1]$.

Remark 2.5.5. Let π be a path with weight in P, and $\pi = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_s\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s)$ an expression of π. Then the path $\mathrm{cl}(\pi)$ with weight in P_{cl} has an expression of the form: $\mathrm{cl}(\pi) = (\mathrm{cl}(\nu_1), \mathrm{cl}(\nu_2), \ldots, \mathrm{cl}(\nu_s)\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s)$. Here an expression of a path with weight in P_{cl} is defined similarly to that of a path with weight in P (see Definition 2.5.1).

Root operators on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ are defined similarly to those on $\mathbb{P} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$; we denote them also by e_j and f_j for each $j \in I$. We know from [NS3, Lemma 2.7 (1)] that

$$\mathrm{cl}(e_j\pi) = e_j\,\mathrm{cl}(\pi), \quad \mathrm{cl}(f_j\pi) = f_j\,\mathrm{cl}(\pi) \quad \text{for } \pi \in \mathbb{P} \text{ and } j \in I, \tag{2.5.5}$$

where $\mathrm{cl}(\mathbf{0})$ is understood to be $\mathbf{0}$. Note that we have a natural action of the Weyl group W on $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P_{\mathrm{cl}} \simeq \mathfrak{h}^*/\mathbb{Q}\delta$, since $W\delta = \delta$. In the same manner as we defined S_w, $w \in W$, on $\mathbb{P}$, this time using root operators on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$, we can define an action, also denoted by S_w, $w \in W$, of the Weyl group W on the set $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ such that $(S_w\eta)(1) = w(\eta(1))$ for every $w \in W$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$. In fact, we have

$$\mathrm{cl}(S_w\pi) = S_w\,\mathrm{cl}(\pi) \quad \text{for every } w \in W \text{ and } \pi \in \mathbb{P}. \tag{2.5.6}$$

A path $\eta \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is said to be extremal if for every $w \in W$, either $e_jS_w\eta = \mathbf{0}$ or $f_jS_w\eta = \mathbf{0}$ holds for each $j \in I$.

Remark 2.5.6. It immedaitely follows from (2.5.6) that a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ is extremal if and only if $\mathrm{cl}(\pi) \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is extremal. In particular, it follows from Remark 2.5.4 that the straight line $\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\nu) \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is extremal for every $\nu \in P$.

2.6 Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths. Let $\lambda \in P$ be an integral weight. Now we give the definition of a Lakshmibai-Seshadri path of shape λ.

Definition 2.6.1 (cf. [L2, Section 4]). A Lakshmibai-Seshadri path (LS path for short) of shape λ is a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ having an expression of the form: $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_s\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s)$, where $\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_s \in W\lambda$, and where for each $1 \le u \le s-1$, there exists a σ_u-chain for (ν_u, ν_{u+1}). We denote by $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ the set of all LS paths of shape λ.

Remark 2.6.2. (1) Let π be an LS path of shape λ, and $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_s\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_s)$ an arbitrary expression of π. Then, we see from Remark 2.5.2 that $\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_s \in W\lambda$, and that for each $1 \le u \le s-1$, there exists an σ_u-chain for (ν_u, ν_{u+1}).

(2) It can easily be seen from part (1) and (2.5.2) that $\pi_\nu \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ if and only if $\nu \in W\lambda$.

(3) It follows from the definitions that $\mathbb{B}(w\lambda) = \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ for every $w \in W$.

Theorem 2.6.3 ([L2, Sections 2 and 4]). *Let $\lambda \in P$ be an integral weight.*

(1) *We have $\pi(1) \in \lambda + Q$ for all $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, where $Q := \sum_{j \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$.*

(2) *The set $\mathbb{B}(\lambda) \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is stable under the root operators e_j and f_j for all $j \in I$.*

(3) *We set*

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{wt}(\pi) := \pi(1) & \text{for } \pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda), \\ \varepsilon_j(\pi) := \max\bigl\{l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \mid e_j^l \pi \ne \mathbf{0}\bigr\} & \text{for } \pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \text{ and } j \in I, \\ \varphi_j(\pi) := \max\bigl\{l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \mid f_j^l \pi \ne \mathbf{0}\bigr\} & \text{for } \pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda) \text{ and } j \in I. \end{cases} \tag{2.6.1}$$

Then the set $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, together with the root operators e_j, f_j for $j \in I$ and the maps wt, *ε_j, φ_j, $j \in I$, becomes a P-crystal, i.e., a crystal associated to the Cartan datum $(A, \Pi, \Pi^\vee, P, P^\vee)$* (*see* [HK, Section 4.5 and Section 10.2]).

Lemma 2.6.4. *Let $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ for $i \in I_0$, be a level-zero dominant integral weight, and let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. Then, $\pi(1) \in \lambda - a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q}_+ + a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}\delta$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.6.3 (1) that $\pi(1) \in \lambda + Q$. We set $\theta := \delta - a_0\alpha_0$ (see [Kac, Proposition 6.4]). Since $\theta \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+ \subset \overset{\circ}{Q}_+$ and $\alpha_0 = a_0^{-1}(\delta - \theta)$, we see that $Q \subset a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q} + a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}\delta$, where $\overset{\circ}{Q} := \sum_{j \in I_0} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_j$. Hence we have $\pi(1) \in \lambda + a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q} + a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}\delta$.

Let $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_s\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_s)$ be an expression of the LS path $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ as in Definition 2.6.1. Then it follows from Definition 2.5.1 that $\pi(1) = \sum_{u=1}^{s} (\sigma_u - \sigma_{u-1})\nu_u$, where $\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_s \in W\lambda$ by the definition of an LS path. Hence we see from Lemma 2.3.3 that $\pi(1) \in \lambda - \sum_{j \in I_0} \mathbb{Q}_{\ge 0}\alpha_j + \mathbb{Q}\delta$. Noting that α_j, $j \in I_0$, and δ are linearly independent, we deduce from the above that $\pi(1) \in \lambda - a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q}_+ + a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}\delta$. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Let us set $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}} := \mathrm{cl}(\mathbb{B}(\lambda)) = \bigl\{\mathrm{cl}(\pi) \mid \pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)\bigr\} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}$. We know the following theorem from [NS3, Theorem 2.4 and Section 3.1];

Theorem 2.6.5. *Let $\lambda \in P$ be an integral weight.*

(1) *The set $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}} \cup \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is stable under the root operators e_j and f_j for all $j \in I$.*

(2) *We set* $\mathrm{wt}(\eta) := \eta(1) \in P_{\mathrm{cl}}$ *for* $\eta \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$, *and define* $\varepsilon_j(\eta)$ *and* $\varphi_j(\eta)$ *for* $\eta \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ *and* $j \in I$ *as in* (2.6.1). *Then, the set* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$, *together with the root operators* e_j, f_j *for* $j \in I$ *and the maps* wt, ε_j, φ_j *for* $j \in I$, *becomes a* P_{cl}*-crystal, i.e., a crystal associated to the classical Cartan datum* $(A, \mathrm{cl}(\Pi), \Pi^{\vee}, P_{\mathrm{cl}}, P_{\mathrm{cl}}^{\vee})$ (*see* [HK, Section 10.2]).

Here we summarize main results of [NS3] in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6.6 ([NS3, Section 3]). *Let* $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, *with* $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *for* $i \in I_0$, *be a level-zero dominant integral weight. Then*:

(1) *The* P_{cl}*-crystal* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ *is connected.*

(2) *There exists a unique isomorphism of* P_{cl}*-crystals* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \bigl(\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}\bigr)^{\otimes m_i}$ *that maps* $\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$ *to* $\bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \bigl(\mathrm{cl}(\pi_{\varpi_i})\bigr)^{\otimes m_i}$.

(3) *The* P_{cl}*-crystal* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ *is simple* (*in the sense of* [NS3, Definition 3.17]). *Namely, the set of all extremal paths in* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ *coincides with the* W*-orbit of the straight line* $\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$, *and the set of all paths of weight* $\mathrm{cl}(\lambda)$ *in* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ *consists only of the straight line* $\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$.

We proved in [NS2, Propositions 3.4.1 and 3.4.2] that the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is isomorphic as a P_{cl}-crystal to the crystal base of the (finite-dimensional, irreducible) level-zero fundamental module $W(\varpi_i)$, introduced in [Kas3, Section 5.2], over the quantized universal enveloping algebra $U_q'(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ (or rather, of the derived subalgebra $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ of $\mathfrak{g}$) over the field $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ of rational functions with weight lattice P_{cl}.

2.7 δ-shifts of paths. We know the following lemma from [NS2, Lemma 3.3.1].

Lemma 2.7.1. *Let* π, $\pi' \in \mathbb{P}$, *and let* $F : [0,1] \to \mathbb{Q}$ *be a piecewise linear, continuous map such that* $F(0) = 0$ *and* $F(1) \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. *Assume that* $\pi(t) = \pi'(t) + F(t)\delta$ *for all* $t \in [0,1]$. *Then*:

(1) *For each* $j \in I$, $e_j\pi = \mathbf{0}$ *if and only if* $e_j\pi' = \mathbf{0}$. *Moreover, if* $e_j\pi' \neq \mathbf{0}$, *then* $(e_j\pi)(t) = (e_j\pi')(t) + F(t)\delta$ *for all* $t \in [0,1]$.

(2) *For each* $j \in I$, $f_j\pi = \mathbf{0}$ *if and only if* $f_j\pi' = \mathbf{0}$. *Moreover, if* $f_j\pi' \neq \mathbf{0}$, *then* $(f_j\pi)(t) = (f_j\pi')(t) + F(t)\delta$ *for all* $t \in [0,1]$.

Lemma 2.7.2. *Let* π, $\pi' \in \mathbb{P}$, *and let* $F : [0,1] \to \mathbb{Q}$ *be a piecewise linear, continuous map such that* $F(0) = 0$ *and* $F(1) \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. *Assume that* $\pi(t) = \pi'(t) + F(t)\delta$ *for all* $t \in [0,1]$. *Then, for each* $w \in W$, $(S_w\pi)(t) = (S_w\pi')(t) + F(t)\delta$ *for all* $t \in [0,1]$.

Proof. It immediately follows from Lemma 2.7.1 and (2.5.3) that for each $j \in I$, $(S_j\pi)(t) = (S_j\pi')(t) + F(t)\delta$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. Using this equation, we can easily prove the lemma by induction on the length $\ell(w)$ of $w \in W$. $\square$

From Remark 2.5.4, using Lemmas 2.7.1 and 2.7.2, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7.3. *Let $\nu \in P$ be an integral weight, and let $F : [0,1] \to \mathbb{Q}$ be a piecewise linear, continuous map such that $F(0) = 0$ and $F(1) \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Then, the path $\pi_\nu(t)+F(t)\delta$, $t \in [0,1]$, is extremal.*

The next lemma immediately follows from Definition 2.6.1, by using Lemma 2.4.6.

Lemma 2.7.4. *Let $\lambda \in P$ be an integral weight, and let $n \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Then we have $\mathbb{B}(\lambda + n\delta) = \mathbb{B}(\lambda) + \pi_{n\delta}$.*

3 Connected components of the P-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

3.1 Main result. Let $\lambda \in P$ be an integral weight of level zero. Then, λ is equivalent, under the Weyl group $\overset{\circ}{W}(\subset W)$ of finite type, to a unique level-zero dominant integral weight. Since we are interested in the crystal structure of the set $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ of all LS paths of shape λ, we may (and do) assume, in view of Remark 2.6.2 (3), that $\lambda \in P$ is a level-zero dominant integral weight. Hence, we can write the $\lambda \in P$ in the form $\sum_{i \in I_0} m_i\varpi_i + n\delta$, with $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in I_0$ and $n \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, it follows from Lemmas 2.7.1 and 2.7.4 that $\mathbb{B}\bigl(\sum_{i\in I_0} m_i\varpi_i + n\delta\bigr) = \mathbb{B}\bigl(\sum_{i\in I_0} m_i\varpi_i\bigr) + \pi_{n\delta}$, and that the P-crystal $\mathbb{B}\bigl(\sum_{i\in I_0} m_i\varpi_i + n\delta\bigr)$ is "isomorphic" (up to a shift of weights by $n\delta$) to the P-crystal $\mathbb{B}\bigl(\sum_{i\in I_0} m_i\varpi_i\bigr)$. Thus, the problem of determining the P-crystal structure of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ for a level-zero integral weight $\lambda \in P$ is reduced to that for the case in which the $\lambda \in P$ is of the form:

$$\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i\varpi_i, \quad \text{with } m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ for } i \in I_0. \tag{3.1.1}$$

Therefore, in the remainder of this paper, we take (and fix) a level-zero dominant integral weight λ of the form (3.1.1).

Now we set $\mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda) := \bigl\{i \in I_0 \mid m_i \geq 2\bigr\}$,

$$\mathrm{Turn}(\lambda) := \bigcup_{i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)} \bigl\{q/m_i \mid 1 \leq q \leq m_i - 1\bigr\}, \tag{3.1.2}$$

and then denote by s the number of elements of $\mathrm{Turn}(\lambda)$ plus 1. When the set $\mathrm{Turn}(\lambda)$ is nonempty, we enumerate the elements of $\mathrm{Turn}(\lambda)$ in increasing order as follows:

$$\mathrm{Turn}(\lambda) = \bigl\{\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_{s-1}\bigr\}, \tag{3.1.3}$$

where τ_u denotes the u-th smallest element in $\mathrm{Turn}(\lambda)$ for $1 \le u \le s-1$; by convention, we set $\tau_0 := 0$ and $\tau_s := 1$. For each $1 \le u \le s-1$, we write $\tau_u \in \mathrm{Turn}(\lambda)$ as $\tau_u = q_u/p_u$, where $p_u,\, q_u \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ are coprime, and then set $I_0(\lambda, p_u) := \bigl\{ i \in I_0 \mid m_i \in p_u\mathbb{Z} \bigr\}$.

The aim in this section is to prove the following theorem, which gives a parametrization of the connected components of the P-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

Theorem 3.1.1. (1) *Let $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ be a path that has the following expression*:

$$\begin{gathered}(\lambda - N_1\delta,\, \dots,\, \lambda - N_{s-1}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \tau_0,\, \tau_1,\, \dots,\, \tau_{s-1},\, \tau_s), \\ \text{with} \quad N_u - N_{u+1} \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p_u)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le u \le s-1,\end{gathered} \tag{3.1.4}$$

where $N_s := 0$. Then, $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ is an extremal LS path of shape λ.

(2) *Each connected component of the P-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ contains exactly one* (*extremal*) *LS path having an expression of the form* (3.1.4)*.*

(3) *The set of all extremal LS paths in each connected component of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ coincides with the W-orbit of an LS path having an expression of the form* (3.1.4)*.*

Let $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ denote the connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ containing the straight line π_λ; note that π_λ has an expression of the form (3.1.4) for $N_1 = \cdots = N_{s-1} = 0$. We deduce from Theorem 3.1.1, along with Lemma 2.7.1, that each connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is "isomorphic" (up to a shift of weights by a constant multiple of δ) to the connected component $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. In other words, the crystal graph of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ consists of "copies" of that of $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. Furthermore, it follows from Theorem 3.1.1 that these copies are parametrized by the sequences $(N_1,\, N_2,\, \dots,\, N_{s-1})$ of nonnegative integers satisfying the condition that $N_u - N_{u+1} \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p_u)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ for $1 \le u \le s-1$, where $N_s := 0$. Later in Section 4, we will study the P-crystal structure of the connected component $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$.

3.2 Some preliminary lemmas. The following lemma immediately follows from Lemma 2.3.4.

Lemma 3.2.1. (1) *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of the form $\xi = -\beta + c_\beta\delta$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, and let $\nu \in P$ be a level-zero integral weight. Then, $\nu(\xi^\vee) = -\nu(\beta^\vee)$, and $r_\xi(\nu) = \nu - \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta + \nu(\beta^\vee)c_\beta\delta$.*

(2) *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of the form $\xi = \frac{1}{2}(-\beta + \delta)$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, and let $\nu \in P$ be a level-zero integral weight. Then, $\nu(\xi^\vee) = -2\nu(\beta^\vee)$, and $r_\xi(\nu) = \nu - \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta + \nu(\beta^\vee)\delta$.*

We derive the next lemma from Lemma 3.2.1.

Lemma 3.2.2. *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of one of the following forms: $\xi = \beta$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, $\xi = -\beta + c_\beta \delta$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, or $\xi = \frac{1}{2}(-\beta + \delta)$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$. Let $\nu \in P$ be a level-zero integral weight. Then, we have $r_\xi(\nu) = r_\beta(\nu) + n\delta$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Definition 3.2.3 (see Lemma 2.3.3). Let λ be the (fixed) level-zero dominant integral weight of the form (3.1.1), and write each $\nu \in W\lambda$ as $\nu = \lambda - \alpha + n\delta$ with $\alpha \in \mathring{Q}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We set

$$\mathrm{fin}(\nu) := \alpha, \qquad D(\nu) := n, \tag{3.2.1}$$

and call the $\mathrm{fin}(\nu) = \alpha$ above the finite part of ν.

For $\alpha = \sum_{j \in I_0} u_j \alpha_j \in \mathring{Q}_+$, we define the support $\mathrm{supp}(\alpha) \subset I_0$ of α by:

$$\mathrm{supp}(\alpha) = \bigl\{ j \in I_0 \mid u_j \neq 0 \bigr\}. \tag{3.2.2}$$

Lemma 3.2.4. (1) *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of the form: $\xi = \beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, and assume that $\nu \in W\lambda$ satisfies $\nu(\xi^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu)) = \mathrm{supp}\bigl(\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu))\bigr) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta), \\ D(r_\xi(\nu)) = D(\nu). \end{cases} \tag{3.2.3}$$

(2) *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of the form: $\xi = -\beta + c_\beta \delta$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, and assume that $\nu \in W\lambda$ satisfies $\nu(\xi^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{supp}\bigl(\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu))\bigr) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta), \\ D(r_\xi(\nu)) = D(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee) c_\beta. \end{cases} \tag{3.2.4}$$

(3) *Let $\xi \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ be a positive real root of the form: $\xi = \frac{1}{2}(-\beta + \delta)$ with $\beta \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$, and assume that $\nu \in W\lambda$ satisfies $\nu(\xi^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{supp}\bigl(\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu))\bigr) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta), \\ D(r_\xi(\nu)) = D(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee). \end{cases} \tag{3.2.5}$$

Proof. (1) First, note that $\nu = \lambda - \mathrm{fin}(\nu) + D(\nu)\delta$ by the definition of $\mathrm{fin}(\nu)$ and $D(\nu)$ (see Definition 3.2.3). Therefore, we have

$$r_\xi(\nu) = \nu - \nu(\xi^\vee)\xi = \nu - \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta = \lambda - \bigl\{\mathrm{fin}(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta\bigr\} + D(\nu)\delta.$$

Hence we obtain that $\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu)) = \mathrm{fin}(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta$ and $D(r_\xi(\nu)) = D(\nu)$. Since $\nu(\beta^\vee) = \nu(\xi^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ by assumption, we deduce that $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu)) = \mathrm{supp}\bigl(\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu))\bigr) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta)$. This proves part (1).

(2) Because $r_\xi(\nu) = \nu - \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta + \nu(\beta^\vee)c_\beta\delta$ by Lemma 3.2.1 (1), and $\nu = \lambda - \mathrm{fin}(\nu) + D(\nu)\delta$ by definition, we have

$$r_\xi(\nu) = \lambda - \bigl\{\mathrm{fin}(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta\bigr\} + \bigl\{D(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)c_\beta\bigr\}\delta.$$

Hence we obtain that $\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu)) = \mathrm{fin}(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta$ and $D(r_\xi(\nu)) = D(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)c_\beta$. Since $\nu(\beta^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by Lemma 3.2.1 (1), we deduce that $\mathrm{supp}\bigl(\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu))\bigr) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta)$. This proves part (2).

(3) Because $r_\xi(\nu) = \nu - \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta + \nu(\beta^\vee)\delta$ by Lemma 3.2.1 (2), and $\nu = \lambda - \mathrm{fin}(\nu) + D(\nu)\delta$ by definition, we have

$$r_\xi(\nu) = \lambda - \bigl\{\mathrm{fin}(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta\bigr\} + \bigl\{D(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)\bigr\}\delta.$$

Hence we obtain that $\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi(\nu)) = \mathrm{fin}(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)\beta$ and $D(r_\xi(\nu)) = D(\nu) + \nu(\beta^\vee)$. Because $\nu(\beta^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by Lemma 3.2.1 (2), we deduce that $\mathrm{supp}\bigl(\mathrm{fin}(r_\xi\nu)\bigr) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta)$. This proves part (3). □

Lemma 3.2.5. *Let $\beta = \sum_{j \in I_0} u_j\alpha_j$ be an element of $\overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$, with $u_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $j \in I_0$. Then, $u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/(\beta, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all $j \in I_0$, and $\lambda(\beta^\vee) = \sum_{j \in I_0} m_j u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/(\beta, \beta)$.*

Proof. Since $u_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all $j \in I_0$, it follows from [Kac, Proposition 5.1 (d)] that $u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/(\beta, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all $j \in I_0$. Furthermore, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\beta^\vee) &= \frac{2(\lambda, \beta)}{(\beta, \beta)} = \sum_{j \in I_0} \frac{2u_j(\lambda, \alpha_j)}{(\beta, \beta)} = \sum_{j \in I_0} \frac{2(\lambda, \alpha_j)}{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)} \cdot \frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta, \beta)} \\ &= \sum_{j \in I_0} \lambda(h_j)\frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta, \beta)} = \sum_{j \in I_0} m_j \frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta, \beta)}.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

3.3 Necessary condition for the existence of a (q/p)-chain.

Let λ be the (fixed) level-zero dominant integral weight of the form (3.1.1). This subsection is devoted to proving the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3.1. *Let $1 \leq q < p$ be coprime integers, and let $N \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that there exists a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda, \lambda + N\delta)$. Then, $N \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*

From Proposition 3.3.1 along with Lemma 2.4.6, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3.2. *Let $1 \leq q < p$ be coprime integers, and let N', $N'' \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that there exists a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda - N'\delta, \lambda - N''\delta)$. Then, $N' - N'' \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*

Now, let $\lambda = \nu_0 > \nu_1 > \cdots > \nu_k = \lambda + N\delta$ be a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda, \lambda + N\delta)$, with $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_k$ the corresponding positive real roots; recall from Definition 2.4.5 that $\nu_{l-1} > \nu_l = r_{\xi_l}(\nu_{l-1})$, with $\mathrm{dist}(\nu_{l-1}, \nu_l) = 1$, and $\nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee) \in p\mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for all $1 \leq l \leq k$. For each $1 \leq l \leq k$, let us denote by $\beta_l \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ the finite part $\overline{\xi_l}$ of $\xi_l \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ (see Definition 2.2.2). Since $\mathrm{dist}(\nu_{l-1}, \nu_l) = 1$, we know from Lemma 2.4.4 that ξ_l is of one of the following forms: $\xi_l = \beta_l$, $\xi_l = -\beta_l + c_{\beta_l}\delta$, or $\xi_l = \frac{1}{2}(-\beta_l + \delta)$. We define subsets Pos, Neg_1, Neg_2, and Neg of $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ as follows:

$$\mathrm{Pos} = \{1 \leq l \leq k \mid \xi_l = \beta_l\}, \tag{3.3.1}$$

$$\mathrm{Neg}_1 = \{1 \leq l \leq k \mid \xi_l = -\beta_l + c_{\beta_l}\delta\}, \tag{3.3.2}$$

$$\mathrm{Neg}_2 = \{1 \leq l \leq k \mid \xi_l = \tfrac{1}{2}(-\beta_l + \delta)\}, \tag{3.3.3}$$

$$\mathrm{Neg} = \mathrm{Neg}_1 \cup \mathrm{Neg}_2 . \tag{3.3.4}$$

Note that $\mathrm{Neg}_2 = \emptyset$ unless $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$.

Remark 3.3.3. We know from Lemma 3.2.4 that

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l) & \text{if } l \in \mathrm{Pos}, \\ \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l) & \text{if } l \in \mathrm{Neg}, \end{cases} \tag{3.3.5}$$

and that

$$D(\nu_l) = \begin{cases} D(\nu_{l-1}) & \text{if} \quad l \in \mathrm{Pos}, \\ D(\nu_{l-1}) + \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)c_{\beta_l} & \text{if} \quad l \in \mathrm{Neg}_1, \\ D(\nu_{l-1}) + \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) & \text{if} \quad l \in \mathrm{Neg}_2 . \end{cases} \tag{3.3.6}$$

Lemma 3.3.4. *If* $l \in \mathrm{Pos}$, *then* $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}) - \mathrm{fin}(\nu_l) \in p\mathring{Q}_+$.

Proof. We see from the proof of part (1) of Lemma 3.2.4 that $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l) = \mathrm{fin}(r_{\xi_l}(\nu_{l-1})) = \mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}) + \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)\beta_l$. Also, it follows from the definition of a (q/p)-chain that $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) = \nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee) \in p\mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ (note that $l \in \mathrm{Pos}$). Therefore, we obtain that $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}) - \mathrm{fin}(\nu_l) = -\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)\beta_l \in p\mathring{Q}_+$. This proves the lemma. □

We set $I_0(\lambda, p) := \{i \in I_0 \mid m_i \in p\mathbb{Z}\}$.

Lemma 3.3.5. *The support* $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$ *of* β_l *is contained in the set* $I_0(\lambda, p)$ *for all* $1 \leq l \leq k$.

Proof. Suppose that there exists $1 \leq l \leq k$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l) \not\subset I_0(\lambda, p)$. We set

$$\Phi := \{1 \leq l \leq k \mid \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l) \not\subset I_0(\lambda, p)\} \neq \emptyset. \tag{3.3.7}$$

Claim 1. *Neither* $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos}$ *nor* $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg}$ *is empty. Moreover, if we set* $l_0 := \max(\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos})$ *and* $k_0 := \max(\Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg})$*, then we have* $k_0 < l_0$*.*

First, we note that both of the sets $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos}$ and $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg}$ are not empty, since $\Phi \neq \emptyset$. Now, suppose that $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg} = \emptyset$. Then we have $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos} \neq \emptyset$. Set $l_0' := \min\bigl(\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos}\bigr)$, and let $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0'})$ be such that $m_i \notin p\mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0'-1})) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0'})) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0'})$ by (3.3.5), it follows that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0'-1}))$. Then, because $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_0)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\lambda)) = \mathrm{supp}(0) = \emptyset$, there exists $1 \leq l \leq l_0' - 1$ such that $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$. Hence we have $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) \not\supset \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$. Therefore, we deduce from (3.3.5) that $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$, and $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$. Since $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$, we see that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$. As a result, we obtain that $l \in \Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg}$, and hence $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg} \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. Thus we conclude that $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg} \neq \emptyset$.

Set $k_0 := \max(\Phi \cap \mathrm{Neg})$, and let $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{k_0})$ be such that $m_i \notin p\mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{k_0})) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{k_0-1})) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{k_0})$ by (3.3.5), it follows that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{k_0}))$. Then, because $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_k)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\lambda + N\delta)) = \mathrm{supp}(0) = \emptyset$, there exists $k \geq l > k_0$ such that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$. This implies that $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) \not\subset \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$. Hence we deduce from (3.3.5) that $l \in \mathrm{Pos}$, and that $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$. Since $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$, we see that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$. As a result, we obtain that $l \in \Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos}$, and hence $\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos} \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, since $l > k_0$, we have $l_0 > k_0$. This proves Claim 1.

Since $l_0 \in \mathrm{Pos}$, we see that ν_{l_0-1} and ν_{l_0} are contained in the same $\mathring{W}$-orbit. Let λ' be the unique level-zero dominant integral weight in $\mathring{W}\nu_{l_0-1} = \mathring{W}\nu_{l_0}$. Then, it follows that $\lambda' = \lambda + n'\delta$ for some $n' \in \mathbb{Z}$. Indeed, since $W = \mathring{W} \ltimes T$, $\nu_{l_0} \in W\lambda$ can be written as $w'w''\lambda$ for some $w' \in \mathring{W}$ and $w'' \in T$. Hence we have $(w')^{-1}\nu_{l_0} = w''\lambda \in T\lambda$. Since $T\lambda \subset \lambda + \mathbb{Z}\delta$ by Lemma 2.3.2, we have $w''\lambda = \lambda + n'\delta$ for some $n' \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, $(w')^{-1}\nu_{l_0} = \lambda + n'\delta$ is a level-zero dominant integral weight contained in $\mathring{W}\nu_{l_0}$. Thus we conclude that $\lambda' = (w')^{-1}\nu_{l_0} = \lambda + n'\delta$.

Now, let $w_{l_0-1} \in \mathring{W}$ (resp., $w_{l_0} \in \mathring{W}$) be the shortest element in $\mathring{W}$ such that $\nu_{l_0-1} = w_{l_0-1}(\lambda + n'\delta)$ (resp., $\nu_{l_0} = w_{l_0}(\lambda + n'\delta)$).

Claim 2. *Assume that* $w_{l_0} = r_{j_K} r_{j_{K-1}} \cdots r_{j_1}$ *is a reduced expression of* $w_{l_0} \in \mathring{W}$*, where* $j_1, \ldots, j_{K-1}, j_K \in I_0$*. Then,* $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_K$ *are all contained in* $I_0(\lambda, p)$*.*

We set $\mu_0 := \lambda + n'\delta$, and $\mu_L := r_{j_L} r_{j_{L-1}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\lambda + n'\delta)$ for $1 \leq L \leq K$; note that $\mu_K = \nu_{l_0}$. Since $r_{j_K} r_{j_{K-1}} \cdots r_{j_1}$ is a reduced expression of the shortest element $w_{l_0} \in \mathring{W}$ such that $\nu_{l_0} = w_{l_0}(\lambda + n'\delta)$, it follows that $\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq L \leq K$. Suppose now that

$\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) < 0$ for some $1 \le L \le K$. Then we have $r_{j_1} \cdots r_{j_{L-1}}(\alpha_{j_L}) \in -\mathring{\Delta}_+$, since $\lambda + n'\delta$ is level-zero dominant. Hence, using [Kac, Lemma 3.10], we deduce that $r_{j_1} \cdots r_{j_{L-1}} r_{j_L}$ is not a reduced expression, which contradicts our assumption that $r_{j_K} r_{j_{K-1}} \cdots r_{j_1}$ is a reduced expression of w_{l_0}. Thus we obtain that $\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) > 0$ for all $1 \le L \le K$, and hence that

$$\nu_{l_0} = \mu_K = \lambda - \sum_{L=1}^{K} \underbrace{\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L})}_{>0} \alpha_{j_L} + n'\delta. \tag{3.3.8}$$

Therefore, if the assertion of Claim 2 is false, then $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0}))$ must contain some $i \in I_0$ such that $i \notin I_0(\lambda, p)$. Then, since $\operatorname{fin}(\nu_k) = \operatorname{fin}(\lambda + N\delta) = 0$, there exists $k \ge l > l_0$ such that $i \in \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \notin \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_l))$. This implies that $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) \not\subset \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_l))$. Hence we deduce from (3.3.5) that $l \in \mathrm{Pos}$, and $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) = \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_l)) \cup \operatorname{supp}(\beta_l)$. Since $i \in \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \notin \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_l))$, we see that $i \in \operatorname{supp}(\beta_l)$. As a result, we obtain that $l \in \Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos}$ and $l > l_0$, which contradicts the definition: $l_0 = \max(\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos})$. This proves Claim 2.

Because $\nu_{l_0-1} > \nu_{l_0}$ and $\operatorname{dist}(\nu_{l_0-1}, \nu_{l_0}) = 1$, we see from [L2, Remark 4.2] that w_{l_0-1} is greater than w_{l_0} with respect to the Bruhat ordering on $\mathring{W}$, and $\ell(w_{l_0-1}) - \ell(w_{l_0}) = 1$. Therefore, the reduced expression of w_{l_0} above is obtained from a reduced expression of w_{l_0-1} by removing a simple reflection r_{i_0} for some $i_0 \in I_0$. Namely, $w_{l_0-1} \in \mathring{W}$ has a reduced expression of the form: $w_{l_0-1} = r_{j_K} \cdots r_{j_{L_0+1}} r_{i_0} r_{j_{L_0}} \cdots r_{j_1}$.

Claim 3. *The $i_0 \in I_0$ above is not contained in $I_0(\lambda, p)$.*

It immediately follows from (3.3.5) that $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1})) = \operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0})) \cup \operatorname{supp}(\beta_{l_0})$. Since $\operatorname{supp}(\beta_{l_0}) \not\subset I_0(\lambda, p)$ by the definition of l_0, we have $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1})) \not\subset I_0(\lambda, p)$. By an argument similar to that used to obtain (3.3.8), we deduce that

$$\nu_{l_0-1} = w_{l_0-1}(\lambda + n'\delta) \in \lambda - \left\{ \sum_{L=1}^{L_0} \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\alpha_{j_L} + \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\alpha_{i_0} + \sum_{L=L_0+1}^{K} \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\alpha_{j_L} \right\} + n'\delta.$$

Hence we have $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1})) = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K\} \cup \{i_0\}$. But, since $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K \in I_0(\lambda, p)$ by Claim 2, and $\operatorname{supp}(\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1})) \not\subset I_0(\lambda, p)$, we conclude that $i_0 \notin I_0(\lambda, p)$. This proves Claim 3.

Claim 4. *The coefficient of α_{i_0} in $\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1}) - \operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0})$ is contained in $m_{i_0} + p\mathbb{Z}$.*

From Claims 2 and 3, we have $j_L \ne i_0$ for all $1 \le L \le K$. Therefore, we see from (3.3.8) that the coefficient of α_{i_0} in $\operatorname{fin}(\nu_{l_0})$ is equal to 0.

Let us compute the coefficient of α_{i_0} in $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1})$; recall that

$$\nu_{l_0-1} = w_{l_0-1}(\lambda + n'\delta) = r_{j_K} \cdots r_{j_{L_0+1}} r_{i_0} r_{j_{L_0}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\lambda + n'\delta).$$

First we derive inductively that

$$r_{j_{L_0}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\lambda + n'\delta) \in \lambda - \sum_{L=1}^{L_0} (m_{j_{L_0}}\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + m_{j_1}\mathbb{Z})\alpha_{j_L} + n'\delta.$$

Since $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_{L_0} \in I_0(\lambda, p)$ by Claim 2, it follows that

$$r_{j_{L_0}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\lambda + n'\delta) \in \lambda - \sum_{L=1}^{L_0} p\mathbb{Z}\alpha_{j_L} + n'\delta.$$

Furthermore, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i_0} r_{j_{L_0}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\lambda + n'\delta) &\in \lambda - m_{i_0}\alpha_{i_0} - \left\{ \sum_{L=1}^{L_0} p\mathbb{Z}\alpha_{j_L} - \sum_{L=1}^{L_0} p\mathbb{Z}\alpha_{j_L}(h_{i_0})\alpha_{i_0} \right\} + n'\delta \\ &\subset \lambda - (m_{i_0} + p\mathbb{Z})\alpha_{i_0} - \sum_{L=1}^{L_0} p\mathbb{Z}\alpha_{j_L} + n'\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Here, again noting that $j_L \neq i_0$ for all $1 \leq L \leq K$, we see that the coefficient of α_{i_0} in the finite part $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1})$ of $\nu_{l_0-1} = r_{j_K} \cdots r_{j_{L_0+1}} r_{i_0} r_{j_{L_0}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\lambda + n'\delta)$ is equal to that in the finite part of $r_{i_0} r_{j_{L_0}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\lambda + n\delta)$. Hence we conclude that the coefficient of α_{i_0} in the finite part $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1})$ of ν_{l_0-1} is contained in $m_{i_0} + p\mathbb{Z}$.

Thus the coefficient of α_{i_0} in $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1}) - \mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0})$ is contained in $m_{i_0} + p\mathbb{Z}$. This proves Claim 4.

We know from Lemma 3.3.4 that $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1}) - \mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0}) \in p\overset{\circ}{Q}_+$, since $l_0 = \max(\Phi \cap \mathrm{Pos}) \in \mathrm{Pos}$. However, because the $i_0 \in I_0$ is not contained in $I_0(\lambda, p)$ by Claim 3, it follows from Claim 4 that the coefficient of α_{i_0} in $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1}) - \mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0})$ is not contained in $p\mathbb{Z}$. This implies that $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0-1}) - \mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l_0}) \notin p\overset{\circ}{Q}_+$, which is a contradiction. Thus we have proved Lemma 3.3.5. $\square$

It follows from (3.3.6) that

$$N = D(\lambda + N\delta) = D(\nu_k) = \sum_{l \in \mathrm{Neg}_1} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) c_{\beta_l} + \sum_{l \in \mathrm{Neg}_2} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee). \tag{3.3.9}$$

Therefore, in order to prove Proposition 3.3.1 (i.e., that $N \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$), it suffices to establish the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3.6. (1) *If* $l \in \mathrm{Neg}_1$*, then* $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)c_{\beta_l} \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$*.*

(2) *If* $l \in \mathrm{Neg}_2$*, then* $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$*.*

Proof. We set $\beta_l' := r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_{l-1}}(\beta_l) \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}$ for each $1 \leq l \leq k$; note that $\beta_1' = \beta_1$.

Claim 1. *We have* $(\beta_l', \beta_l') = (\beta_l, \beta_l)$*, and* $(\lambda, \beta_l') = (\nu_{l-1}, \beta_l)$ *for all* $1 \leq l \leq k$*. Hence* $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) = \lambda(\beta_l'^\vee)$ *for all* $1 \leq l \leq k$*. Moreover,* $\beta_l' \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$ *for every* $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$*.*

Since the bilinear form $(\cdot\,,\,\cdot)$ is W-invariant, we have $(\beta_l', \beta_l') = (\beta_l, \beta_l)$. In addition, we deduce from Lemma 3.2.2 that $r_{\xi_1} r_{\xi_2} \cdots r_{\xi_{l-1}}(\beta_l) = r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_{l-1}}(\beta_l) + n''\delta = \beta_l' + n''\delta$ for some $n'' \in \mathbb{Z}$, and hence that

$$\begin{aligned}(\nu_{l-1}, \beta_l) &= (r_{\xi_{l-1}} r_{\xi_{l-2}} \cdots r_{\xi_1}(\nu_0), \beta_l) = (r_{\xi_{l-1}} r_{\xi_{l-2}} \cdots r_{\xi_1}(\lambda), \beta_l) \\ &= (\lambda, r_{\xi_1} r_{\xi_2} \cdots r_{\xi_{l-1}}(\beta_l)) = (\lambda, \beta_l' + n''\delta) = (\lambda, \beta_l').\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using the equations $(\beta_l', \beta_l') = (\beta_l, \beta_l)$ and $(\nu_{l-1}, \beta_l) = (\lambda, \beta_l')$, we obtain that

$$\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) = \frac{2(\nu_{l-1}, \beta_l)}{(\beta_l, \beta_l)} = \frac{2(\lambda, \beta_l')}{(\beta_l', \beta_l')} = \lambda(\beta_l'^\vee).$$

Furthermore, because β_l is the finite part $\overline{\xi_l}$ of $\xi_l \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$, and $\nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee) \in p\mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ by the definition of (q/p)-chains, we see from Lemma 3.2.1 that $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) > 0$ for every $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$. As a result, we obtain that $(\lambda, \beta_l') = (\nu_{l-1}, \beta_l) > 0$. Hence we conclude that $\beta_l' \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$, since λ is a level-zero dominant integral weight. This proves Claim 1.

The following claim immediately follows from Lemma 3.3.5.

Claim 2. *The support* $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l')$ *of* $\beta_l' \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ *is contained in* $I_0(\lambda, p)$ *for every* $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$*.*

We now prove part (1) of Lemma 3.3.6. Since $l \in \mathrm{Neg}_1$, we see from Claim 1 that $\beta_l' \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$. Let us write $\beta_l' \in \overset{\circ}{\Delta}_+$ as: $\beta_l' = \sum_{j \in I_0} u_{lj} \alpha_j$, with $u_{lj} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $j \in I_0$.

First assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is nontwisted. Then we know from Remark 2.1.1 (1) and (2.3.1) that $c_{\beta_l} = 1$, and $d_j = 1$ for all $j \in I_0$. From Claim 1 and Lemma 3.2.5, we deduce that

$$\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)c_{\beta_l} = \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) = \lambda(\beta_l'^\vee) = \sum_{j \in I_0} m_j \underbrace{\frac{u_{lj}(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta_l', \beta_l')}}_{\in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}.$$

Furthermore, since $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l') \subset I_0(\lambda, p)$ by Claim 2, it follows that $u_{lj} = 0$ unless $j \in I_0(\lambda, p)$. Hence we obtain that $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)c_{\beta_l} \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} = \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Next assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is twisted. Then we know from Remark 2.1.1 (2) and (2.3.1) that $c_{\beta_l} = (\beta_l, \beta_l)/2$, and

$$\frac{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{2} = \begin{cases} 2d_j & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2\ell}^{(2)} \text{ and } j = \ell, \\ d_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.3.10}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^{\vee})c_{\beta_l} &= \frac{2(\nu_{l-1}, \beta_l)}{(\beta_l, \beta_l)} c_{\beta_l} = (\nu_{l-1}, \beta_l) = (\lambda, \beta_l') \quad \text{by Claim 1} \\ &= \sum_{j \in I_0} u_{lj}(\lambda, \alpha_j) = \sum_{j \in I_0} u_{lj} \frac{2(\lambda, \alpha_j)}{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)} \cdot \frac{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{2} \\ &= \sum_{j \in I_0} u_{lj} \lambda(h_j) \frac{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{2} = \sum_{j \in I_0} u_{lj} m_j \frac{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $u_{lj} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all $j \in I_0$, and that $(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)/2 \in d_j\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for all $j \in I_0$ by (3.3.10). Also, since $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l') \subset I_0(\lambda, p)$ by Claim 2, it follows that $u_{lj} = 0$ unless $j \in I_0(\lambda, p)$. Hence we obtain that $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^{\vee})c_{\beta_l} \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. This completes the proof of part (1) of Lemma 3.3.6.

Let us prove part (2) of Lemma 3.3.6; note that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$, since $\mathrm{Neg}_2 \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, we know from Remark 2.1.1 (2) and (2.3.1) that $d_j = 1$ for all $j \in I_0$. We see from Claim 1 and Lemma 3.2.5 that

$$\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^{\vee}) = \lambda(\beta_l'^{\vee}) = \sum_{j \in I_0} m_j \underbrace{\frac{u_{lj}(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta_l', \beta_l')}}_{\in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}.$$

Furthermore, since $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l') \subset I_0(\lambda, p)$ by Claim 2, it follows that $u_{lj} = 0$ unless $j \in I_0(\lambda, p)$. Hence we obtain that $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^{\vee}) \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} = \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p)} m_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. This completes the proof of part (2) of Lemma 3.3.6. □

As mentioned just above Lemma 3.3.6, Proposition 3.3.1 immediately follows from Lemma 3.3.6 and (3.3.9). Thus we have completed the proof of Proposition 3.3.1.

3.4 Sufficient condition for the existence of a (q/p)-chain. Let λ be the (fixed) level-zero dominant integral weight of the form (3.1.1). This subsection is devoted to proving the following proposition.

Proposition 3.4.1. *Let $1 \leq q < p$ be coprime integers, and let $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then, there exists a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda, \lambda + N\delta)$ if $N \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*

From Proposition 3.4.1 along with Lemma 2.4.6, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4.2. *Let* $1 \leq q < p$ *be coprime integers, and let* N', $N'' \in \mathbb{Z}$. *Then, there exists a* (q/p)*-chain for* $(\lambda - N'\delta,\ \lambda - N''\delta)$ *if* $N' - N'' \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

In order to prove Proposition 3.4.1, we need some lemmas. From now till the end of the proof of Proposition 3.4.9 below, we fix $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$ arbitrarily. We set $\mathrm{Supp}(\lambda) := \bigl\{ i \in I_0 \mid m_i \geq 1 \bigr\} \subset I_0$, and $S(\lambda, i) := \bigl(I_0 \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\lambda) \bigr) \cup \{i\}$.

Definition 3.4.3. Let $\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$ denote the set of positive real roots $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$, with $\gamma := \overline{\zeta} \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ its finite part, satisfying the the following conditions:

(a) ζ is either of the form $\zeta = -\gamma + c_\gamma \delta$, or of the form $\zeta = \frac{1}{2}(-\gamma + \delta)$,

(b) the support $\mathrm{supp}(\gamma)$ of γ is contained in $S(\lambda, i)$, and contains the (fixed) $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$,

(c) $r_\zeta(\lambda) = \lambda - \alpha + m_i d_i \delta$ for some $\alpha \in \mathring{Q}_+$.

Lemma 3.4.4. *The set* $\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$ *is not empty.*

Proof. First assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$, and that the simple root corresponding to the $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$ is the long simple root (i.e., $i = \ell$). We set $\zeta := \frac{1}{2}(-\alpha_i + \delta)$; note that ζ is indeed a positive real root by Proposition 2.2.1 (2). It is obvious that this $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ satisfies conditions (a) and (b) of Definition 3.4.3. Also, we see from Lemma 3.2.1 (2) that $r_\zeta(\lambda) = \lambda - \lambda(h_i)\alpha_i + \lambda(h_i)\delta = \lambda - m_i\alpha_i + m_i\delta$. Since $d_i = 1$ by (2.3.1), it follows that ζ satisfies condition (c) of Definition 3.4.3. Thus we obtain that $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$, and hence $\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i) \neq \emptyset$.

Next assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is not of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$, or $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$ and the simple root corresponding to the $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$ is not the long simple root (i.e., $i \neq \ell$). We set $\zeta := -\alpha_i + c_{\alpha_i}\delta$; note that ζ is indeed a positive real root by Proposition 2.2.1. It is obvious that this $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ satisfies conditions (a) and (b) of Definition 3.4.3. Also, we see from Lemma 3.2.1 (1) that $r_\zeta(\lambda) = \lambda - \lambda(h_i)\alpha_i + \lambda(h_i)c_{\alpha_i}\delta = \lambda - m_i\alpha_i + m_i c_{\alpha_i}\delta$. Since $d_i = c_{\alpha_i}$ by (2.3.1), it follows that ζ satisfies condition (c) of Definition 3.4.3. Thus we obtain that $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$, and hence $\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i) \neq \emptyset$. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 3.4.5. *For every* $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$, *we have* $\lambda(\zeta^\vee) \in m_i\mathbb{Z}_{<0}$.

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ be the finite part $\overline{\zeta}$ of $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$. We deduce from condition (a) of Definition 3.4.3, using Lemma 3.2.1, that $\lambda(\zeta^\vee) = -\lambda(\gamma^\vee)$, or $-2\lambda(\gamma^\vee)$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\lambda(\gamma^\vee) \in m_i\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Write $\gamma \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ as $\sum_{j \in I_0} u_j \alpha_j$, with $u_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $j \in$

I_0. It follows from condition (b) of Definition 3.4.3 that $u_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for the $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$, and $u_j = 0$ for $j \notin S(\lambda, i)$. Hence, using Lemma 3.2.5, we deduce that

$$\lambda(\gamma^\vee) = \sum_{j \in I_0} m_j \frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\gamma, \gamma)} = \sum_{j \in S(\lambda, i)} m_j \frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\gamma, \gamma)}.$$

Note that, by the definition of $S(\lambda, i)$, we have $m_j = 0$ for all $j \in S(\lambda, i)$ with $j \neq i$. Consequently,

$$\lambda(\gamma^\vee) = \sum_{j \in S(\lambda, i)} m_j \frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\gamma, \gamma)} = m_i \frac{u_i(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{(\gamma, \gamma)}.$$

Since $u_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ as seen above, we obtain from Lemma 3.2.5 that $u_i(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/(\gamma, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Thus we conclude that $\lambda(\gamma^\vee) \in m_i\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, as desired. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 3.4.6. *Let $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$, with $\gamma := \overline{\zeta} \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ its finite part. Then, the finite part* $\mathrm{fin}(r_\zeta(\lambda))$ *of $r_\zeta(\lambda) \in W\lambda$ equals $\lambda(\gamma^\vee)\gamma$. Hence the support of* $\mathrm{fin}(r_\zeta(\lambda))$ *is contained in $S(\lambda, i)$, and contains the $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$.*

Proof. By condition (a) of Definition 3.4.3, ζ is either of the form $\zeta = -\gamma + c_\gamma\delta$, or of the form $\zeta = \frac{1}{2}(-\gamma + \delta)$. It immediately follows from Lemma 3.2.1 that

$$r_\zeta(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \lambda - \lambda(\gamma^\vee)\gamma + \lambda(\gamma^\vee)c_\gamma\delta & \text{if } \zeta = -\gamma + c_\gamma\delta, \\ \lambda - \lambda(\gamma^\vee)\gamma + \lambda(\gamma^\vee)\delta & \text{if } \zeta = \frac{1}{2}(-\gamma + \delta). \end{cases}$$

Recall from the proof of Lemma 3.4.5 that $\lambda(\gamma^\vee) \in m_i\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Hence the finite part $\mathrm{fin}(r_\zeta(\lambda))$ of $r_\zeta(\lambda) \in W\lambda$ equals $\lambda(\gamma^\vee)\gamma$. Furthermore, it follows from condition (b) of Definition 3.4.3 that the support of $\mathrm{fin}(r_\zeta(\lambda)) = \lambda(\gamma^\vee)\gamma$ is contained in $S(\lambda, i)$, and contains the $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$. This proves the lemma. □

Now we take an element $\zeta_i \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$ such that the finite part of ζ_i is maximal with respect to the (usual) partial ordering defined by $\mathring{Q}_+$. Namely, let ζ_i be an element of $\Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$ such that there exists no $\zeta \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$ with $\mathrm{fin}(r_\zeta(\lambda)) - \mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) \in \mathring{Q}_+ \setminus \{0\}$. Let us denote by $\gamma_i \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ the finite part $\overline{\zeta_i}$ of ζ_i.

Lemma 3.4.7. *We have $\lambda(\zeta_i^\vee) \in m_i\mathbb{Z}_{<0}$, and hence $\lambda > r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)$. Moreover, we have* $\mathrm{dist}(\lambda,\, r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = 1$.

Proof. It is obvious from Lemma 3.4.5 that $\lambda(\zeta_i^\vee) \in m_i\mathbb{Z}_{<0}$, and hence $\lambda > r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)$. We will prove that $\mathrm{dist}(\lambda,\, r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = 1$. Assume that $\mathrm{dist}(\lambda,\, r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = k \geq 1$, and let $\lambda = \nu_0 > \nu_1 > \cdots > \nu_k = r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)$ be a longest chain for $(\lambda,\, r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda))$, with $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_k$ the corresponding positive real roots. Then we have $\nu_{l-1} > r_{\xi_l}(\nu_{l-1}) = \nu_l$ and $\mathrm{dist}(\nu_{l-1}, \nu_l) = 1$ for each

$1 \le l \le k$. Let β_l denote the finite part $\overline{\xi_l}$ of $\xi_l \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}$ for $1 \le l \le k$. Since $\mathrm{dist}(\nu_{l-1}, \nu_l) = 1$, we see from Lemma 2.4.4 that ξ_l is one of the following forms: $\xi_l = \beta_l$, $\xi_l = -\beta_l + c_{\beta_l}\delta$, or $\xi_l = \frac{1}{2}(-\beta_l + \delta)$. We define subsets Pos, Neg_1, Neg_2, and Neg of $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ as in (3.3.1), (3.3.2), (3.3.3), and (3.3.4), respectively. It follows from Lemma 3.2.4 (see also Remark 3.3.3) that

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l) & \text{if } l \in \mathrm{Pos}, \\ \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l) & \text{if } l \in \mathrm{Neg}, \end{cases} \tag{3.4.1}$$

and that

$$D(\nu_l) = \begin{cases} D(\nu_{l-1}) & \text{if } \ l \in \mathrm{Pos}, \\ D(\nu_{l-1}) + \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) c_{\beta_l} & \text{if } \ l \in \mathrm{Neg}_1, \\ D(\nu_{l-1}) + \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) & \text{if } \ l \in \mathrm{Neg}_2 \,. \end{cases} \tag{3.4.2}$$

Because $D(\nu_k) = D(r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = m_i d_i$ by condition (c) of Definition 3.4.3, we have

$$m_i d_i = D(\nu_k) \overset{\text{by (3.4.2)}}{=} \sum_{l \in \mathrm{Neg}_1} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) c_{\beta_l} + \sum_{l \in \mathrm{Neg}_2} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee). \tag{3.4.3}$$

For each $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$, we set

$$D_l := \begin{cases} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) c_{\beta_l} & \text{if } l \in \mathrm{Neg}_1, \\ \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) & \text{if } l \in \mathrm{Neg}_2. \end{cases} \tag{3.4.4}$$

We see from Lemma 3.2.1 that $D_l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for all $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$, since $\nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ and $c_{\beta_l} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Also, we see from (3.4.3) that

$$m_i d_i = \sum_{l \in \mathrm{Neg}} D_l. \tag{3.4.5}$$

Claim 1. *There exists* $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$ *such that the (fixed)* $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\ge 2}(\lambda)$ *is contained in* $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$.

We know from Lemma 3.4.6 that the support of the finite part $\mathrm{fin}(\nu_k)$ of $\nu_k = r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda) \in W\lambda$ contains the $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\ge 2}(\lambda)$. Because $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_0)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\lambda)) = \mathrm{supp}(0) = \emptyset$, it follows that there exists $1 \le l \le k$ such that $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$. Therefore, we see from (3.4.1) that $l \in \mathrm{Neg}$, and $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$. But, since $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l))$, we have $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$. This proves Claim 1.

We set $l_0 := \min\{l \in \mathrm{Neg} \mid i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)\}$.

Claim 2. *If* $l \in \mathrm{Pos}$ *and* $l < l_0$, *then* $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$ *does not contain the (fixed)* $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\ge 2}(\lambda)$.

Suppose that there exists $l \in \mathrm{Pos}$ such that $l < l_0$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$. It follows from (3.4.1) that $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1})) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_l)) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)$, and hence $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l-1}))$. Because $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_0)) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\lambda)) = \mathrm{supp}(0) = \emptyset$, there exists $1 \le l' \le l-1$ such that $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l'-1}))$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l'}))$. Therefore, we see from (3.4.1) that $l' \in \mathrm{Neg}$, and $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l'})) = \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l'-1})) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l'})$. But, since $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l'-1}))$ and $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{fin}(\nu_{l'}))$, we have $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l'})$, which contradicts the definition: $l_0 = \min\bigl\{l \in \mathrm{Neg} \mid i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_l)\bigr\}$. This proves Claim 2.

We set $\beta'_{l_0} := r_{\beta_1} r_{\beta_2} \cdots r_{\beta_{l_0-1}}(\beta_{l_0})$.

Claim 3. *The support* $\mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})$ *of* β'_{l_0} *contains the (fixed)* $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\ge 2}(\lambda)$.

We set $\beta_{l_0,l'} := r_{\beta_{l'}} r_{\beta_{l'+1}} \cdots r_{\beta_{l_0-1}}(\beta_{l_0})$ for $1 \le l' \le l_0 - 1$, and $\beta_{l_0,l_0} = \beta_{l_0}$; note that $\beta_{l_0,1} = \beta'_{l_0}$. It suffices to show that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0,l'})$ for all $1 \le l' \le l_0$ (put $l' = 1$). We show this by descending induction on l'. If $l' = l_0$, then it follows from the definition of l_0 that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0,l_0}) = \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0})$. Assume that $l' < l_0$. Then we have $\beta_{l_0,l'} = r_{\beta_{l'}}(\beta_{l_0,l'+1}) = \beta_{l_0,l'+1} - \beta_{l_0,l'+1}(\beta_{l'}^{\vee})\beta_{l'}$. Because $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l'})$ by Claim 2 and the definition of l_0, we deduce that the coefficient of α_i in $\beta_{l_0,l'}$ equals that in $\beta_{l_0,l'+1}$. This implies that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0,l'})$ since $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0,l'+1})$ by the inductive assumption. Thus we have shown that $i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0,l'})$ for all $1 \le l' \le l_0$, as desired. This proves Claim 3.

By an argument similar to that used to prove Claim 1 in the proof of Lemma 3.3.6, we can prove the following claim.

Claim 4. *We have* $(\beta'_{l_0}, \beta'_{l_0}) = (\beta_{l_0}, \beta_{l_0})$, *and* $(\lambda, \beta'_{l_0}) = (\nu_{l_0-1}, \beta_{l_0})$. *Moreover,* $\nu_{l_0-1}(\beta_{l_0}^{\vee}) = \lambda(\beta'^{\vee}_{l_0})$, *and* $\beta'_{l_0} \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$.

Claim 5. *The following inequality holds:* $D_{l_0} \ge \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j d_j$.

Write $\beta'_{l_0} \in \mathring{\Delta}_+$ as $\sum_{j \in I_0} u_j \alpha_j$, with $u_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ for $j \in I_0$.

First assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is nontwisted (note that $l_0 \in \mathrm{Neg}_1$, since $\mathrm{Neg}_2 = \emptyset$). Then we know from Remark 2.1.1 (1) and (2.3.1) that $c_{\beta_{l_0}} = 1$, and $d_j = 1$ for all $j \in I_0$. Using Claim 4 and Lemma 3.2.5, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{l_0} = \nu_{l_0-1}(\beta_{l_0}^{\vee}) c_{\beta_{l_0}} = \nu_{l_0-1}(\beta_{l_0}^{\vee}) = \lambda(\beta'^{\vee}_{l_0}) &= \sum_{j \in I_0} m_j \frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta'_{l_0}, \beta'_{l_0})} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j \underbrace{\frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta'_{l_0}, \beta'_{l_0})}}_{\in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \ge \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j = \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j d_j. \end{aligned}$$

Next assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is twisted, and $l_0 \in \mathrm{Neg}_1$. Then we know from Remark 2.1.1 (2) and (2.3.1) that $c_{\beta_{l_0}} = (\beta_{l_0}, \beta_{l_0})/2$, and that

$$\frac{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{2} = \begin{cases} 2d_j & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } A_{2\ell}^{(2)} \text{ and } j = \ell, \\ d_j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the same manner as in the proof of Lemma 3.3.6, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{l_0} = \nu_{l_0-1}(\beta_{l_0}^{\vee}) c_{\beta_{l_0}} &= \sum_{j \in I_0} u_j m_j \frac{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{2} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} u_j m_j \underbrace{\frac{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{2}}_{\in d_j \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \geq \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j d_j. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type $A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$, and $l_0 \in \mathrm{Neg}_2$. Then we know from Remark 2.1.1 (2) and (2.3.1) that $d_j = 1$ for all $j \in I_0$. Using Claim 4 and Lemma 3.2.5, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{l_0} = \nu_{l_0-1}(\beta_{l_0}^{\vee}) = \lambda(\beta_{l_0}'^{\vee}) &= \sum_{j \in I_0} m_j \frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta'_{l_0}, \beta'_{l_0})} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j \underbrace{\frac{u_j(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}{(\beta'_{l_0}, \beta'_{l_0})}}_{\in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \geq \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j = \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j d_j. \end{aligned}$$

This proves Claim 5.

From (3.4.5) and Claim 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_i d_i = \sum_{l \in \mathrm{Neg}} D_l \geq D_{l_0} & \qquad \text{since } D_l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \text{ for all } l \in \mathrm{Neg} \\ \geq \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j d_j \geq m_i d_i & \qquad \text{since } i \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0}) \text{ by Claim 3.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$m_i d_i = \sum_{l \in \mathrm{Neg}} D_l = D_{l_0} = \sum_{j \in \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0})} m_j d_j,$$

and hence that

$$\mathrm{Neg} = \bigl\{l_0\bigr\}, \quad D_{l_0} = m_i d_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{supp}(\beta'_{l_0}) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(\lambda) = \bigl\{i\bigr\}. \tag{3.4.6}$$

Claim 6. *We have* $l_0 = 1$*. Moreover, the support* $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_{l_0})$ *of* $\beta_{l_0} = \beta_1$ *is contained in* $S(\lambda, i)$*, and contains the (fixed)* $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda)$*.*

Suppose that $1 \in \mathrm{Pos}$. Then we have $\lambda(\xi_1^\vee) = \lambda(\beta_1^\vee)$. But, since λ is a level-zero dominant integral weight, we have $\lambda(\beta_1^\vee) > 0$, and hence $\lambda(\xi_1^\vee) > 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus we have $1 \in \mathrm{Neg}$. Since $\mathrm{Neg} = \bigl\{l_0\bigr\}$, we conclude that $l_0 = 1$. Note that $\beta'_{l_0} = \beta'_1 = \beta_1$ by the definition of β'_{l_0}. Hence it follows from (3.4.6) that $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_1) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(\lambda) = \bigl\{i\bigr\}$, i.e., that $\mathrm{supp}(\beta_1)$ is contained in $S(\lambda, i) = \bigl(I_0 \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\lambda)\bigr) \cup \{i\}$. This proves Claim 6.

Claim 7. *We have* $\xi_{l_0} = \xi_1 \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$*.*

It is obvious that ξ_1 satisfies condition (a) of Definition 3.4.3, since $1 \in \mathrm{Neg}$. Also, it follows from Claim 6 that ξ_1 satisfies condition (b) of Definition 3.4.3. Furthermore, from Lemma 3.2.1 and (3.4.4), we see that $r_{\xi_1}(\lambda) = \lambda - \lambda(\beta_1^\vee)\beta_1 + D_1\delta$, with $\lambda(\beta_1^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. But, it follows from (3.4.6) and Claim 6 that $D_1 = m_i d_i$. Thus, ξ_1 satisfies condition (c) of Definition 3.4.3. This proves Claim 7.

From Claim 6, we have $\mathrm{Neg} = \bigl\{1\bigr\}$ and $\mathrm{Pos} = \bigl\{2,\, 3,\, \ldots,\, k\bigr\}$. Hence we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_k = r_{\xi_k} r_{\xi_{k-1}} \cdots r_{\xi_1}(\lambda) &= \lambda - \sum_{l=1}^{k} \nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee)\xi_l = \lambda - \nu_0(\xi_1^\vee)\xi_1 - \sum_{l=2}^{k} \nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee)\xi_l \\ &= \lambda - \lambda(\xi_1^\vee)\xi_1 - \sum_{l=2}^{k} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)\beta_l \quad \text{since } \nu_0 = \lambda, \text{ and } \mathrm{Pos} = \bigl\{2,\, 3,\, \ldots,\, k\bigr\}, \\ &= r_{\xi_1}(\lambda) - \sum_{l=2}^{k} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)\beta_l.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = \mathrm{fin}(\nu_k) = \mathrm{fin}(r_{\xi_1}(\lambda)) + \sum_{l=2}^{k} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)\beta_l. \tag{3.4.7}$$

Since $\nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee) = \nu_{l-1}(\xi_l^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for all $l \in \mathrm{Pos} = \bigl\{2,\, 3,\, \ldots,\, k\bigr\}$, we see from (3.4.7) that $\mathrm{fin}(r_{\xi_1}(\lambda)) - \mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = -\sum_{l=2}^{k} \nu_{l-1}(\beta_l^\vee)\beta_l \in \overset{\circ}{Q}_+$. Therefore, the definition of $\zeta_i \in \Delta_+^{\mathrm{re}}(\lambda, i)$ implies that $\mathrm{fin}(r_{\xi_1}(\lambda)) - \mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = 0$, and hence that $\mathrm{Pos} = \emptyset$, $k = 1$. Thus we have proved $\mathrm{dist}(\lambda, r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) = 1$. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4.7. □

Now we set $\mu := r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)$. Then we see from condition (c) of Definition 3.4.3, using Lemma 3.2.1, that $\mu = r_{\gamma_i}(\lambda + m_i d_i \delta)$; note that $r_{\gamma_i} \in \overset{\circ}{W}$. Let $w \in \overset{\circ}{W}$ be the shortest element such that $w(\lambda + m_i d_i \delta) = \mu$, and let $w = r_{j_1} r_{j_2} \cdots r_{j_K}$ be a reduced expression, where $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_K \in I_0$. We set $\mu_0 = \mu$, and $\mu_L := r_{j_L} r_{j_{L-1}} \cdots r_{j_1}(\mu)$ for $1 \le L \le K$; note that $\mu_K = w^{-1}(\mu) = \lambda + m_i d_i \delta$. Then, using [Kac, Lemma 3.10], we can show that $\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for all $1 \le L \le K$. Hence we have $\mu = \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \mu_2 > \cdots > \mu_K = \lambda + m_i d_i \delta$.

Moreover, it follows that $\mu_K = w^{-1}(\mu) = r_{j_K} \cdots r_{j_2} r_{j_1}(\mu) = \mu - \sum_{L=1}^{K} \mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) \alpha_{j_L}$. Also, we see from condition (c) of Definition 3.4.3 that $\mu = r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda) = \lambda - \mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda)) + m_i d_i \delta$. Combining these equations, we obtain that

$$\mu_K = \lambda - \left(\mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}\lambda) + \sum_{L=1}^{K} \underbrace{\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L})}_{\in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}} \alpha_{j_L} \right) + m_i d_i \delta.$$

Since $\mu_K = \lambda + m_i d_i \delta$, we have

$$\mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}\lambda) + \sum_{L=1}^{K} \underbrace{\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L})}_{\in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}} \alpha_{j_L} = 0.$$

Recall from Lemma 3.4.6 that the support of the finite part $\mathrm{fin}(r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda))$ of $r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda) \in W\lambda$ is contained in $S(\lambda, i)$. Therefore, we conclude that $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_K \in S(\lambda, i)$.

Lemma 3.4.8. (1) *We have* $\mathrm{dist}(\mu_{L-1}, \mu_L) = 1$ *for all* $1 \le L \le K$.

(2) *We have* $\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) \in m_i \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ *for all* $1 \le L \le K$.

Proof. (1) Since the positive real root corresponding to (μ_{L-1}, μ_L) is the simple root $\alpha_{j_L} \in \overset{\circ}{\Pi}$, the assertion immediately follows from Remark 2.4.3 (2).

(2) Because $\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{<0}$ for all $1 \le L \le K$ as shown in the argument above this lemma, we need only show that $\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) \in m_i \mathbb{Z}$ for all $1 \le L \le K$. We will show this by induction on L.

Assume first that $L = 1$. From condition (c) of Definition 3.4.3 and Lemma 3.4.6, we deduce that $\mu_0 = \mu = r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda) = \lambda - \lambda(\gamma_i^\vee)\gamma_i + m_i d_i \delta$. Since $j_1 \in S(\lambda, i) = \big(I_0 \setminus \mathrm{Supp}(\lambda)\big) \cup \{i\}$ as shown just above this lemma, it follows that $\lambda(h_{j_1}) = m_i$ if $j_1 = i$, and $\lambda(h_{j_1}) = 0$ if $j_1 \ne i$. In addition, we see from the proof of Lemma 3.4.5 that $\lambda(\gamma_i^\vee) \in m_i \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Therefore, we obtain that

$$\mu_0(h_{j_1}) = \underbrace{\lambda(h_{j_1})}_{0 \text{ or } m_i} - \underbrace{\lambda(\gamma_i^\vee)}_{\in m_i \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \underbrace{\gamma_i(h_{j_1})}_{\in \mathbb{Z}} + m_i d_i \underbrace{\delta(h_{j_1})}_{=0} \in m_i \mathbb{Z}.$$

Assume next that $L > 1$. Because $\mu_{L-1} = \mu - \sum_{L'=1}^{L-1} \mu_{L'-1}(h_{j_{L'}}) \alpha_{j_{L'}}$, it follows that $\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) = \mu(h_{j_L}) - \sum_{L'=1}^{L-1} \mu_{L'-1}(h_{j_{L'}}) \alpha_{j_{L'}}(h_{j_L})$. Here, in the same manner as above, we see that

$$\mu(h_{j_L}) = \underbrace{\lambda(h_{j_L})}_{0 \text{ or } m_i} - \underbrace{\lambda(\gamma_i^\vee)}_{\in m_i\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \underbrace{\gamma_i(h_{j_L})}_{\in\mathbb{Z}} + m_i d_i \underbrace{\delta(h_{j_L})}_{=0} \in m_i\mathbb{Z}.$$

Also, it follows from the inductive assumption that $\mu_{L'-1}(h_{j_{L'}}) \in m_i\mathbb{Z}$ for all $1 \le L' \le L-1$. Since $\alpha_{j_{L'}}(h_{j_L}) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $1 \le L' \le L-1$, we conclude that

$$\mu_{L-1}(h_{j_L}) = \underbrace{\mu(h_{j_L})}_{\in m_i\mathbb{Z}} - \sum_{L'=1}^{L-1} \underbrace{\mu_{L'-1}(h_{j_{L'}})}_{\in m_i\mathbb{Z}} \underbrace{\alpha_{j_{L'}}(h_{j_L})}_{\in\mathbb{Z}} \in m_i\mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus we have proved the lemma. ☐

Proposition 3.4.9. *For each $1 \le q' \le m_i - 1$, there exists a (q'/m_i)-chain for $(\lambda, \lambda + m_i d_i \delta)$.*

Proof. Combining Lemmas 3.4.7 and 3.4.8, we see that $\lambda > r_{\zeta_i}(\lambda) = \mu_0 > \mu_1 > \mu_2 > \cdots > \mu_K = \lambda + m_i d_i \delta$ is a (q'/m_i)-chain for $(\lambda,\ \lambda + m_i d_i \delta)$, with ζ_i, α_{j_1}, α_{j_2}, $\ldots$, α_{j_K} the corresponding positive real roots. This proves the proposition. ☐

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.4.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.4.1. We will prove this proposition by induction on N. If $N = 0$, then the assertion is obvious. Assume that $N > 0$. We write N as $\sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j k_j$ with $k_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ for $j \in I_0(\lambda, p)$, and take $i \in I_0(\lambda, p)$ such that $k_i > 0$, $m_i > 0$ (and hence $m_i \ge 2$, i.e., $i \in \mathrm{Supp}_{\ge 2}(\lambda)$). Note that we have $q/p = q'/m_i$ for some $1 \le q' \le m_i - 1$, since $m_i \in p\mathbb{Z}$. We know from Proposition 3.4.9 that there exists a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda, \lambda + m_i d_i \delta)$; we write it as: $\lambda = \nu_0 > \nu_1 > \cdots > \nu_K = \lambda + m_i d_i \delta$, with ξ_1, ξ_2, $\ldots$, ξ_K the corresponding positive real roots. Since $m_i > 0$ and $k_i > 0$, it follows that $N > N - m_i d_i \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$. Therefore, by the inductive assumption, there exists a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda, \lambda + (N - m_i d_i)\delta)$. Hence we deduce from Lemma 2.4.6 that there exists a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda + m_i d_i \delta,\ \lambda + N\delta)$; we write it as: $\lambda + m_i d_i \delta = \nu'_0 > \nu'_1 > \cdots > \nu'_{K'} = \lambda + N\delta$, with ξ'_1, ξ'_2, $\ldots$, $\xi'_{K'}$ the corresponding positive real roots. From these two (q/p)-chains, we can construct a (q/p)-chain for $(\lambda,\ \lambda + N\delta)$ as follows:

$$\lambda = \nu_0 > \nu_1 > \cdots > \nu_K = \lambda + m_i d_i \delta = \nu'_0 > \nu'_1 > \cdots > \nu'_{K'} = \lambda + N\delta,$$

where ξ_1, ξ_2, $\ldots$, ξ_K, ξ'_1, ξ'_2, $\ldots$, $\xi'_{K'}$ are the corresponding positive real roots. Thus we have completed the proof of Proposition 3.4.1. ☐

3.5 Proof of Theorem 3.1.1. It follows from Corollary 3.4.2 that a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ having an expression of the form (3.1.4) is indeed an LS path of shape λ (see Definition 2.6.1 of an LS path). Furthermore, we see from Lemma 2.7.3 that such a path $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ is extremal. This proves part (1) of Theorem 3.1.1.

Let us prove part (2) of Theorem 3.1.1. Let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ be an LS path of shape λ. We know from Proposition 2.6.6 (1) that the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is connected. Therefore, there exists some monomial X in the root operators e_j, f_j for $j \in I$ such that $X\,\mathrm{cl}(\pi) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$. Hence it follows from (2.5.5) that $\mathrm{cl}(X\pi) = X\,\mathrm{cl}(\pi) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$. From the fact that $\mathrm{cl}(X\pi) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$, we deduce, using Remark 2.5.5, that the path $\pi' := X\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ has an expression of the form:

$$\pi' = (\lambda - N'_1\delta,\, \dots,\, \lambda - N'_{s'-1}\delta,\ \lambda - N'_{s'}\delta\ ;\ \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{s'-1}, \sigma_{s'}),$$

with $N'_1, N'_2, \dots, N'_{s'} \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $0 = \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \cdots < \sigma_{s'-1} < \sigma_{s'} = 1$. Here we note that the path $\pi' = X\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ is an LS path of shape λ. Therefore, it follows from Remark 2.6.2 (1) that $\lambda - N'_{u'}\delta \in W\lambda$ for all $1 \le u' \le s'$, which along with Lemma 2.3.3 implies that $N'_{u'} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $1 \le u' \le s'$. Now, if we define a path $\psi \in \mathbb{P}$ by: $\psi = \pi_\lambda - \pi'$, then $\psi \in \mathbb{P}$ has an expression of the form:

$$\psi = (N'_1\delta,\, \dots,\, N'_{s'-1}\delta,\ N'_{s'}\delta\ ;\ \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{s'-1}, \sigma_{s'}).$$

Since $\lambda - N'_{s'}\delta \in W\lambda$ by Remark 2.6.2 (1), it follows that there exists some $w \in W$ such that $w\lambda = \lambda + N'_{s'}\delta$. Then, from (2.5.4), we have $S_w\pi_\lambda = \pi_{w\lambda} = \pi_{\lambda + N'_{s'}\delta} = \pi_\lambda + \pi_{N'_{s'}\delta}$. Therefore, by using Lemma 2.7.2, we deduce that

$$S_w\pi' = S_w(\pi_\lambda - \psi) = S_w\pi_\lambda - \psi = \pi_\lambda + \pi_{N'_{s'}\delta} - \psi = \pi' + \pi_{N'_{s'}\delta},$$

and hence that the path $\pi'' := S_w\pi' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ has an expression of the form:

$$\pi'' = (\lambda - N''_1\delta,\, \dots,\, \lambda - N''_{s'-1}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{s'-1}, \sigma_{s'}), \tag{3.5.1}$$

where we set $N''_{u'} := N'_{u'} - N'_{s'}$ for $1 \le u' \le s'$; note that $N''_{s'} = 0$. We will show that $\pi'' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ has an expression of the form (3.1.4).

Assume now that there exists some $1 \le u' \le s' - 1$ such that $\sigma_{u'} \notin \mathrm{Turn}(\lambda)$, and write $\sigma_{u'} = q/p$, where $1 \le q < p$ are coprime integers. Then it can easily be seen from the definition (3.1.2) of $\mathrm{Turn}(\lambda)$ that for each $i \in I_0$, we have $m_i \notin p\mathbb{Z}$ unless $m_i = 0$. This means that there exists no $j \in I_0(\lambda, p)$ such that $m_j > 0$. Hence it follows from Corollary 3.3.2 that $N''_{u'} - N''_{u'+1} \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda,p)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} = \{0\}$, i.e., that $N''_{u'} = N''_{u'+1}$. As a result, we have $\lambda - N''_{u'}\delta = \lambda - N''_{u'+1}\delta$. Thus we can "omit" $\lambda - N''_{u'}\delta$ and $\sigma_{u'}$ from the expression (3.5.1) (see Remark 2.5.2 (1)). Namely, the path $\pi'' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ has an expression of the form:

$$\pi'' = (\lambda - N''_{s'_1}\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N''_{s'_{L-1}}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \sigma_{s'_0},\ \sigma_{s'_1},\ \ldots,\ \sigma_{s'_{L-1}},\ \sigma_{s'_L}), \tag{3.5.2}$$

where $0 = s'_0 < s'_1 < \cdots < s'_L = s'$, and $\sigma_{s'_l} \in \mathrm{Turn}(\lambda) = \{\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_{s-1}\}$ for every $1 \le l \le L-1$. We define an increasing sequence $0 = s_0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_L = s$ so that $\tau_{s_l} = \sigma_{s'_l}$ for every $0 \le l \le L$, and set $N_{s_l} := N''_{s'_l}$ for $1 \le l \le L-1$. Then the expression (3.5.2) of $\pi'' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ can be written as:

$$\pi'' = (\lambda - N_{s_1}\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N_{s_{L-1}}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \tau_{s_0},\ \tau_{s_1},\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s_{L-1}},\ \tau_{s_L}). \tag{3.5.3}$$

Assume next that there exists some $1 \le u \le s-1$ such that $\tau_u \in \mathrm{Turn}(\lambda) \setminus \{\tau_{s_1},\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s_{L-1}}\}$, and let $1 \le l_0 \le L$ be such that $\tau_{s_{l_0-1}} < \tau_u < \tau_{s_{l_0}}$. Then we can "insert" τ_u between $\tau_{s_{l_0-1}}$ and $\tau_{s_{l_0}}$ in the expression (3.5.3) of π'' (see Remark 2.5.2 (2)). Namely, the path $\pi'' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ has an expression of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi'' = (\lambda - N_{s_1}\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N_{s_{l_0-1}}\delta,\ \underbrace{\lambda - N_u\delta}_{\text{inserted}},\ \lambda - N_{s_{l_0}}\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N_{s_{L-1}}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\\ \tau_{s_0},\ \tau_{s_1},\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s_{l_0-1}},\ \underbrace{\tau_u}_{\text{inserted}},\ \tau_{s_{l_0}},\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s_{L-1}},\ \tau_{s_L}),\end{aligned}$$

where we set $N_u := N_{s_{l_0}}$. Repeating these two procedures if necessary, we finally obtain an expression of $\pi'' \in \mathbb{P}$ of the form:

$$\pi'' = (\lambda - N_1\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N_{s-1}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \tau_0,\ \tau_1,\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s-1},\ \tau_s), \tag{3.5.4}$$

where $N_1,\ N_2,\ \ldots,\ N_{s-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\pi'' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is an LS path of shape λ, there exists a τ_u-chain for $(\lambda - N_u\delta,\ \lambda - N_{u+1}\delta)$ for each $1 \le u \le s-1$, where we set $N_s := 0$. Hence it follows from Corollary 3.3.2 that

$$N_u - N_{u+1} \in \sum_{j \in I_0(\lambda, p_u)} m_j d_j \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \quad \text{for each } 1 \le u \le s-1.$$

Thus we have proved that every $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is connected to an LS path of shape λ having an expression of the form (3.1.4), i.e., that each connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ contains an LS path of shape λ having an expression of the form (3.1.4).

Now, let $\pi_1 \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ and $\pi_2 \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ be LS paths having an expression of the form (3.1.4):

$$\pi_1 = (\lambda - N_{1,1}\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N_{1,s-1}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \tau_0,\ \tau_1,\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s-1},\ \tau_s),$$

$$\pi_2 = (\lambda - N_{2,1}\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N_{2,s-1}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \tau_0,\ \tau_1,\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s-1},\ \tau_s),$$

and assume that the paths π_1 and π_2 are in the same connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$. Then, there exists some monomial X' in the root operators e_j, f_j for $j \in I$ such that $X'\pi_1 = \pi_2$. We define a path $\psi_1 \in \mathbb{P}$ by:

$$\psi_1 = (N_{1,1}\delta,\, \ldots,\, N_{1,s-1}\delta,\, 0\,;\, \tau_0,\, \tau_1,\, \ldots,\, \tau_{s-1},\, \tau_s).$$

Note that $\pi_1 = \pi_\lambda - \psi_1$, and hence that $\pi_\lambda = \pi_1 + \psi_1$. We deduce from Lemma 2.7.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} X'\pi_\lambda &= X'(\pi_1 + \psi_1) = \pi_2 + \psi_1 \\ &= (\lambda - (N_{2,1} - N_{1,1})\delta,\, \ldots,\, \lambda - (N_{2,s-1} - N_{1,s-1})\delta,\, \lambda\ ;\ \tau_0,\, \tau_1,\, \ldots,\, \tau_{s-1},\, \tau_s). \end{aligned}$$

Because $X'\pi_\lambda \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is an LS path of shape λ, we see from Remark 2.6.2 (1) that

$$\lambda - (N_{2,1} - N_{1,1})\delta \geq \cdots \geq \lambda - (N_{2,s-1} - N_{1,s-1})\delta \geq \lambda.$$

Hence it follows from Remark 2.4.3 (1) that $N_{2,u} - N_{1,u} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq u \leq s$. By interchanging the roles of π_1 and π_2, we also deduce that $N_{1,u} - N_{2,u} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq u \leq s$. Thus we conclude that $N_{1,u} = N_{2,u}$ for all $1 \leq u \leq s$, and hence $\pi_1 = \pi_2$. This proves part (2) of Theorem 3.1.1.

Finally, let us prove part (3) of Theorem 3.1.1. Let $\pi \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ be an extremal LS path of shape λ. Then we know from Remark 2.5.6 that $\mathrm{cl}(\pi) \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ is extremal. Hence it follows from Theorem 2.6.6 (3) that there exists some $w \in W$ such that $\mathrm{cl}(S_w\pi) = S_w\,\mathrm{cl}(\pi) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$. Here we recall that in the proof of part (2) above, we proved that an LS path $\pi' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ such that $\mathrm{cl}(\pi') = \mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$ is contained in the W-orbit of an extremal LS path having an expression of the form (3.1.4). Therefore, we conclude that $S_w\pi$ (and hence π) is contained in the W-orbit of an extremal LS path having an expression of the form (3.1.4). This proves part (3) of Theorem 3.1.1. Thus we have completed the proof of Theorem 3.1.1.

4 Crystal structure of the connected component $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$.

4.1 Affinization of the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$. We take (and fix) a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear embedding $\mathrm{aff} : \mathfrak{h}^*/\mathbb{Q}\delta \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\mathrm{cl} \circ \mathrm{aff} = \mathrm{id}$, $\mathrm{aff}(\mathrm{cl}(\alpha_j)) = \alpha_j$ for all $j \in I_0$, and such that $\mathrm{aff}(P_{\mathrm{cl}}) \subset P$ (note that $\mathfrak{h}^* \simeq \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P$ and $\mathfrak{h}^*/\mathbb{Q}\delta \simeq \mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} P_{\mathrm{cl}}$). Since $\delta - a_0\alpha_0 = \theta \in \mathring{Q}_+$, we see that $\mathrm{aff}(\mathrm{cl}(\alpha_0)) = \mathrm{aff}(\mathrm{cl}(a_0^{-1}(\delta - \theta))) = -a_0^{-1}\theta$. In addition, since the level-zero fundamental weight ϖ_i is contained in $\bigoplus_{j \in I_0} \mathbb{Q}\alpha_j$ for all $i \in I_0$, it follows that $\mathrm{aff}(\mathrm{cl}(\varpi_i)) = \varpi_i$ for all $i \in I_0$.

Let $\lambda \in P$ be the (fixed) level-zero dominant integral weight of the form (3.1.1). We define a positive integer $d_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by:

$$W\lambda \cap (\lambda + \mathbb{Z}\delta) = \lambda + d_\lambda \mathbb{Z}\delta. \tag{4.1.1}$$

Remark 4.1.1. It follows from Lemma 2.3.2 (see the proof of Lemma 2.3.3) that d_λ is equal to the greatest common divisor of the integers $\{m_i d_i\}_{i \in I_0}$.

Define the affinization $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ of the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ to be the direct product set

$$\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}} := \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}} \times (a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}) \tag{4.1.2}$$

of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ and $a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$; let us denote an element $(\eta, n) \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ by $\eta \otimes z^n$. Now we give a P-crystal structure to $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ as follows. We define the Kashiwara operators e_j, f_j on $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ for $j \in I$ by:

$$e_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = (e_j\eta) \otimes z^n, \quad f_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = (f_j\eta) \otimes z^n \quad \text{for } j \in I_0, \tag{4.1.3}$$

$$e_0(\eta \otimes z^n) = (e_0\eta) \otimes z^{n+a_0^{-1}}, \quad f_0(\eta \otimes z^n) = (f_0\eta) \otimes z^{n-a_0^{-1}}, \tag{4.1.4}$$

for $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$. Here $\mathbf{0} \otimes z^n$ is understood to be $\mathbf{0}$ for each $n \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. We define the weight map $\mathrm{wt} : \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}} \to P$ by:

$$\mathrm{wt}(\eta \otimes z^n) = \mathrm{aff}(\eta(1)) + n\delta \quad \text{for} \quad \eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}, \tag{4.1.5}$$

and define the maps ε_j, $\varphi_j : \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $j \in I$ by:

$$\varepsilon_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \max\{l \geq 0 \mid e_j^l(\eta \otimes z^n) \neq \mathbf{0}\} \quad \text{for} \quad \eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}, \tag{4.1.6}$$

$$\varphi_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \max\{l \geq 0 \mid f_j^l(\eta \otimes z^n) \neq \mathbf{0}\} \quad \text{for} \quad \eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}. \tag{4.1.7}$$

The proof of the following proposition is straightforward.

Proposition 4.1.2. *The set* $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ *equipped with the Kashiwara operators* e_j, f_j *for* $j \in I$, *and the maps* wt, ε_j, φ_j *for* $j \in I$, *is a* P*-crystal.*

4.2 Isomorphism theorem.

Let $\lambda \in P$ be the (fixed) level-zero dominant integral weight of the form (3.1.1). For each $M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta)$ denote the connected component of the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda + M\delta)$ of all LS paths of shape $\lambda + M\delta$ containing the straight line $\pi_{\lambda+M\delta}$.

Lemma 4.2.1. *Let* M_1, $M_2 \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. *Then,* $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M_1\delta) = \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M_2\delta)$ *if and only if* $M_1 - M_2 \in d_\lambda\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M_1\delta) = \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M_2\delta)$. Then the straight line $\pi_{\lambda+M_1\delta}$ is an LS path of shape $\lambda + M_2\delta$. Therefore, it follows from Remark 2.6.2 (2) that $\lambda + M_1\delta \in W(\lambda + M_2\delta)$. Since $W(\lambda + M_2\delta) = W\lambda + M_2\delta$, we have $\lambda + (M_1 - M_2)\delta \in W\lambda$. Thus we obtain that $M_1 - M_2 \in d_\lambda\mathbb{Z}$ from the definition of d_λ.

Conversely, if $M_1 - M_2 \in d_\lambda\mathbb{Z}$, then we deduce from the definition of d_λ that $\lambda + (M_1 - M_2)\delta \in W\lambda$, and hence $\lambda + M_1\delta \in W(\lambda + M_2\delta)$. Therefore, there exists some $w \in W$ such that $\lambda + M_1\delta = w(\lambda + M_2\delta)$. As a result, it follows from (2.5.4) that $S_w\pi_{\lambda+M_2\delta} = \pi_{\lambda+M_1\delta}$. Thus we obtain that $\pi_{\lambda+M_2\delta} \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M_1\delta)$, and hence $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M_1\delta) = \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M_2\delta)$. This proves the lemma. $\square$

The following theorem (along with Corollary 4.2.7) is a generalization of [GL, Proposition 5.9], in which $\mathfrak{g}$ is nontwisted, and $\lambda \in P$ is a positive integer multiple of a level-zero fundamental weight.

Theorem 4.2.2. *Let $\lambda \in P$ be the (fixed) level-zero dominant integral weight of the form* (3.1.1). *Then, there exists an isomorphism Θ of P-crystals*:

$$\Theta : \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigsqcup_{\substack{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 \le M < d_\lambda}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta). \tag{4.2.1}$$

In order to define the map Θ, we need some lemmas.

Lemma 4.2.3. *Let $\eta \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$.*

(1) *The set $\mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ is not empty.*

(2) *Take an arbitrary $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. Then, $\mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda) = \{\pi + \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta} \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.*

Proof. (1) It follows from Theorem 2.6.6 (1) that there exists some monomial X in the root operators e_j, f_j for $j \in I$ such that $\eta = X\,\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)$. We deduce from (2.5.5) that $\eta = \mathrm{cl}(X\pi_\lambda)$, and hence that $X\pi_\lambda \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta)$. Since $X\pi_\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$, we see that $X\pi_\lambda \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. This proves part (1) of the lemma.

(2) First we prove that $\mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda) \supset \{\pi + \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta} \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Take an arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and set $\pi' := \pi + \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta}$. Since it is obvious that $\pi' \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta)$, it remains to show that $\pi' \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. Because $\pi \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ by assumption, there exists some monomial X' in the root operators e_j, f_j for $j \in I$ such that $X'\pi = \pi_\lambda$. Therefore, using Lemma 2.7.1, we deduce that

$$X'\pi' = X'(\pi + \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta}) = X'\pi + \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta} = \pi_\lambda + \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta} = \pi_{\lambda+kd_\lambda\delta}.$$

Note that $\lambda + kd_\lambda\delta \in W\lambda$ by the definition of d_λ. Hence there exists some $w \in W$ such that $\lambda = w(\lambda + kd_\lambda\delta)$. Therefore, we see from (2.5.4) that $S_w\pi_{\lambda+kd_\lambda\delta} = \pi_\lambda$. Thus we obtain that $S_wX'\pi' = S_w\pi_{\lambda+kd_\lambda\delta} = \pi_\lambda$, and hence $\pi' \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. This proves the desired inclusion $\supset$.

Next we prove that $\mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda) \subset \{\pi + \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta} \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Let $\pi' \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. Since $\mathrm{cl}(\pi) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi') = \eta$, there exists a piecewise linear, continuous function $F(t) : [0,1] \to \mathbb{Q}$ such that $F(0) = 0$, $F(1) \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$, and $\pi'(t) = \pi(t) + F(t)\delta$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. Define a path $\psi \in \mathbb{P}$ by: $\psi(t) = F(t)\delta$, $t \in [0,1]$; note that $\pi' = \pi + \psi$. We will show that $\psi = \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $X'\pi = \pi_\lambda$ for the above monomial X' in the root operators, we deduce from Lemma 2.7.1 that $X'\pi' = X'(\pi + \psi) = X'\pi + \psi = \pi_\lambda + \psi$. If we write the path $\psi \in \mathbb{P}$ as: $\psi = (N_1'\delta, N_2'\delta, \ldots, N_{s'}'\delta\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{s'})$, with $N_1', N_2', \ldots, N_{s'}' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 = \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \cdots < \sigma_{s'} = 1$, then we have

$$\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda) \ni X'\pi' = \pi_\lambda + \psi = (\lambda + N_1'\delta, \lambda + N_2'\delta, \ldots, \lambda + N_{s'}'\delta\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{s'}).$$

Since $X'\pi' \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, it follows from Remark 2.6.2 (1) that $\lambda + N_1'\delta \geq \lambda + N_2'\delta \geq \cdots \geq \lambda + N_{s'}'\delta$, and hence that $N_1' \leq N_2' \leq \cdots \leq N_{s'}'$ by Remark 2.4.3 (1). Also, because $X'\pi' \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$, there exists some monomial X'' in the root operators e_j, f_j for $j \in I$ such that $X''X'\pi' = \pi_\lambda$. Therefore, using Lemma 2.7.1, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda) \ni X''\pi_\lambda &= X''(X'\pi' - \psi) = X''X'\pi' - \psi = \pi_\lambda - \psi \\ &= (\lambda - N_1'\delta, \lambda - N_2'\delta, \ldots, \lambda - N_{s'}'\delta\,; \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{s'}).\end{aligned}$$

Again, since $X''\pi_\lambda \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, it follows from Remark 2.6.2 (1) that $\lambda - N_1'\delta \geq \lambda - N_2'\delta \geq \cdots \geq \lambda - N_{s'}'\delta$, and hence that $N_1' \geq N_2' \geq \cdots \geq N_{s'}'$ by Remark 2.4.3 (1). Thus we obtain that $N_1' = N_2' = \cdots = N_{s'}'$. But, since $\lambda + N_1'\delta \in W\lambda$ by Remark 2.6.2 (1), we see from the definition of d_λ that $N_1' = kd_\lambda$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, we conclude that $N_1' = N_2' = \cdots = N_{s'}' = kd_\lambda$, and hence that

$$\psi = (\underbrace{kd_\lambda\delta,\ kd_\lambda\delta, \ldots, kd_\lambda\delta}_{s' \text{ times}}\,;\ \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{s'}) = \pi_{kd_\lambda\delta},$$

as desired. This proves part (2) of the lemma. □

For each $\eta \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$, we define $\pi_\eta^0 \in \mathbb{P}$ as follows: Take an arbitrary $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. It follows from Lemma 2.6.4 that $\pi(1) \in P$ can be written as $\lambda - \alpha + n'\delta$, with $\alpha \in a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q}_+$ and $n' \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Then we set

$$\pi_\eta^0 := \pi - \pi_{n'\delta}. \tag{4.2.2}$$

Remark 4.2.4. We see from Lemma 4.2.3 (2) that π^0_η does not depend on the choice of $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$.

Lemma 4.2.5. *Let $\eta \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}$. Then, for each $j \in I$, we have:*

(1) $\pi^0_{e_j\eta} = e_j\pi^0_\eta - \pi_{\delta_{j,0}a_0^{-1}\delta}$ *if* $e_j\eta \neq \mathbf{0}$,

(2) $\pi^0_{f_j\eta} = f_j\pi^0_\eta + \pi_{\delta_{j,0}a_0^{-1}\delta}$ *if* $f_j\eta \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. We give only the proof of part (1); the proof of part (2) is similar. Let $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$, and assume that $\pi(1) = \lambda - \alpha + n'\delta$, with $\alpha \in a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q}_+$ and $n' \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Note that $e_j\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(e_j\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ by (2.5.5). Because $\alpha_0 = a_0^{-1}(\delta - \theta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(e_j\pi)(1) &= \pi(1) + \alpha_j = \lambda - \alpha + n'\delta + \alpha_j \\ &= \begin{cases} \lambda - (\alpha - \alpha_j) + n'\delta & \text{if } j \neq 0, \\ \lambda - (\alpha + a_0^{-1}\theta) + (n' + a_0^{-1})\delta & \text{if } j = 0. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows from the definition of $\pi^0_{e_j\eta}$ that

$$\pi^0_{e_j\eta} = e_j\pi - \pi_{(n'+\delta_{j,0}a_0^{-1})\delta}. \tag{4.2.3}$$

Also, because $\pi^0_\eta = \pi - \pi_{n'\delta}$ by the definition of π^0_η, we have $e_j\pi^0_\eta = e_j\pi - \pi_{n'\delta}$ by Lemma 2.7.1. Combining this equation with (4.2.3), we obtain that $\pi^0_{e_j\eta} = e_j\pi^0_\eta - \pi_{\delta_{j,0}a_0^{-1}\delta}$. This proves part (1) of the lemma. ☐

Now, let us define a map $\Theta : \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}} \to \mathbb{P}$ by:

$$\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) = \pi^0_\eta + \pi_{n\delta} \quad \text{for} \quad \eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}. \tag{4.2.4}$$

Lemma 4.2.6. *Let $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$, and let $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. Assume that $\pi(1) = \lambda - \alpha + n'\delta$, with $\alpha \in a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q}_+$ and $n' \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Then, $\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda + (n - n')\delta)$.*

Proof. It follows from the definition of the map Θ that

$$\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) = \pi^0_\eta + \pi_{n\delta} = (\pi - \pi_{n'\delta}) + \pi_{n\delta} = \pi + \pi_{(n-n')\delta}. \tag{4.2.5}$$

Therefore, we see from Lemma 2.7.4 that $\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) \in \mathbb{B}(\lambda + (n - n')\delta)$. This proves the lemma. ☐

Proof of Theorem 4.2.2. We will establish this theorem by proving Claims 1, 2, and 3 below.

Claim 1. *Let $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$. Then,* $\mathrm{wt}(\eta \otimes z^n) = \mathrm{wt}(\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n))$.

Let $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$, and assume that $\pi(1) = \lambda - \alpha + n'\delta$, with $\alpha \in a_0^{-1}\mathring{Q}_+$ and $n' \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Then we see from the definition of the $\mathbb{Q}$-linear embedding $\mathrm{aff} : \mathfrak{h}^*/\mathbb{Q}\delta \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$ that $\mathrm{aff}(\eta(1)) = \mathrm{aff}(\mathrm{cl}(\pi(1))) = \mathrm{aff}(\mathrm{cl}(\lambda)) - \mathrm{aff}(\mathrm{cl}(\alpha)) = \lambda - \alpha$. Therefore, by (4.1.5), we have

$$\mathrm{wt}(\eta \otimes z^n) = \mathrm{aff}(\eta(1)) + n\delta = \lambda - \alpha + n\delta.$$

Also, it follows from the definition of π_η^0 that $\pi_\eta^0(1) = \pi(1) - n'\delta = \lambda - \alpha$. Therefore, by the definition of the map Θ, we have

$$\mathrm{wt}(\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n)) = \mathrm{wt}(\pi_\eta^0 + \pi_{n\delta}) = \pi_\eta^0(1) + \pi_{n\delta}(1) = \lambda - \alpha + n\delta.$$

This proves Claim 1.

Claim 2. *Let $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$. Then, for all $j \in I$,*

$$\Theta\big(e_j(\eta \otimes z^n)\big) = e_j\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) \quad \textit{and} \quad \Theta\big(f_j(\eta \otimes z^n)\big) = f_j\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n), \tag{4.2.6}$$

$$\varepsilon_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \varepsilon_j(\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n)) \quad \textit{and} \quad \varphi_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \varphi_j(\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n)). \tag{4.2.7}$$

Here $\Theta(\mathbf{0})$ is understood to be $\mathbf{0}$.

We give only the proof of the equations $\Theta\big(e_j(\eta \otimes z^n)\big) = e_j\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n)$ and $\varepsilon_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \varepsilon_j(\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n))$, since the proof of the corresponding equations for f_j is similar. First, let us show that $e_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $e_j\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) = \mathbf{0}$. Indeed, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} e_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \mathbf{0} \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad e_j\eta = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{by the definition of } e_j \text{ for } \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad e_j\pi = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{by (2.5.5)}, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad e_j\pi_\eta^0 = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{by Lemma 2.7.1 and the definition of } \pi_\eta^0, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad e_j(\pi_\eta^0 + \pi_{n\delta}) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{by Lemma 2.7.1}, \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad e_j\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{by the definition of the map } \Theta. \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that $e_j\pi_\eta^0 \neq \mathbf{0}$ (and hence $e_j\eta \neq \mathbf{0}$). From the definitions of the Kashiwara operator e_j for $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ and the map Θ, we deduce that $\Theta\big(e_j(\eta \otimes z^n)\big) = \Theta(e_j\eta \otimes z^{n+\delta_{j,0}a_0^{-1}}) = \pi_{e_j\eta}^0 + \pi_{(n+\delta_{j,0}a_0^{-1})\delta}$. Furthermore, this equals $e_j\pi_\eta^0 + \pi_{n\delta}$ by Lemma 4.2.5 (1). Also, we see from Lemma 2.7.1 that $e_j\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) = e_j(\pi_\eta^0 + \pi_{n\delta}) = e_j\pi_\eta^0 + \pi_{n\delta}$. Thus we have proved the equation $\Theta\big(e_j(\eta \otimes z^n)\big) = e_j\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n)$. This equation along with (4.1.6) immediately implies the equation $\varepsilon_j(\eta \otimes z^n) = \varepsilon_j(\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n))$. This proves Claim 2.

It follows from Claims 1 and 2, in view of Lemma 4.2.6, that the image $\mathrm{Im}\,\Theta$ of Θ is a subcrystal of $\bigcup_{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{B}(\lambda + M\delta)$.

Claim 3. *The map* $\Theta : \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}} \to \mathbb{P}$ *is injective, and its image* $\operatorname{Im}\Theta$ *is equal to*

$$\bigsqcup_{\substack{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 \le M < d_\lambda}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta). \tag{4.2.8}$$

First we show that the map Θ is injective. Assume that $\Theta(\eta_1 \otimes z^{n_1}) = \Theta(\eta_2 \otimes z^{n_2})$ for some $\eta_1 \otimes z^{n_1}$, $\eta_2 \otimes z^{n_2} \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$. It immediately follows from the definition of the map Θ that $\pi^0_{\eta_1} + \pi_{n_1\delta} = \pi^0_{\eta_2} + \pi_{n_2\delta}$. Also, we have $\mathrm{cl}(\pi^0_{\eta_1}) = \eta_1$ and $\mathrm{cl}(\pi^0_{\eta_2}) = \eta_2$ by the definitions of $\pi^0_{\eta_1}$ and $\pi^0_{\eta_2}$. Hence we obtain that

$$\eta_1 = \mathrm{cl}(\pi^0_{\eta_1}) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi^0_{\eta_1} + \pi_{n_1\delta}) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi^0_{\eta_2} + \pi_{n_2\delta}) = \mathrm{cl}(\pi^0_{\eta_2}) = \eta_2.$$

This implies that $\pi_{n_1\delta} = \pi_{n_2\delta}$, and hence $n_1 = n_2$. Thus we have shown that $\eta_1 \otimes z^{n_1} = \eta_2 \otimes z^{n_2}$, and hence that the map Θ is injective.

Next we show that the image $\operatorname{Im}\Theta$ of Θ is equal to the subset (4.2.8) of $\mathbb{P}$; note that

$$\bigcup_{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta) = \bigsqcup_{\substack{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 \le M < d_\lambda}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta)$$

as seen from Lemma 4.2.1. Since $\pi^0_{\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)}$ is clearly equal to π_λ by the definition of $\pi^0_{\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda)}$, it follows from the definition of Θ that $\Theta(\mathrm{cl}(\pi_\lambda) \otimes t^M) = \pi_\lambda + \pi_{M\delta} = \pi_{\lambda + M\delta}$ for every $M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, we have $\pi_{\lambda+M\delta} \in \operatorname{Im}\Theta$ for all $M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. This implies that

$$\bigcup_{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta) \subset \operatorname{Im}\Theta, \tag{4.2.9}$$

since $\operatorname{Im}\Theta$ is a subcrystal of $\bigcup_{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{B}(\lambda + M\delta)$.

Now, let us show the reverse inclusion. As seen in the proof of Lemma 4.2.6 (see (4.2.5)), every element of $\operatorname{Im}\Theta$ is of the form $\pi + \pi_{n''\delta}$, with $\pi \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ and $n'' \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Since $\pi \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$, there exists some monomial X in the root operators e_j, f_j for $j \in I$ such that $\pi = X\pi_\lambda$. Hence it follows from Lemma 2.7.1 that $X(\pi_{\lambda + n''\delta}) = X(\pi_\lambda + \pi_{n''\delta}) = \pi + \pi_{n''\delta}$. Therefore, we obtain that

$$\bigcup_{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta) \supset \operatorname{Im}\Theta. \tag{4.2.10}$$

Combining (4.2.9) and (4.2.10), we conclude that

$$\operatorname{Im}\Theta = \bigcup_{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta) = \bigsqcup_{\substack{M \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 \le M < d_\lambda}} \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + M\delta).$$

This proves Claim 3.

Thus the proof of Theorem 4.2.2 is completed. □

Corollary 4.2.7. *The connected component* $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ *of* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ *is isomorphic as a* P*-crystal to the subcrystal of* $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ *consisting of all elements* $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ *that satisfy the following condition* (C):

(C) *Let* $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$*, and assume that* $\pi(1) = \lambda - \alpha + n'\delta$ *with* $\alpha \in a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q}_+$ *and* $n' \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$*. Then it holds that* $n' - n \in d_\lambda\mathbb{Z}$*.*

Remark 4.2.8. As is easily seen from Lemma 4.2.3 (2), it does not depend on the choice of $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ whether or not an element $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ satisfies condition (C).

Proof of Corollary 4.2.7. Let $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$, and let $\pi \in \mathrm{cl}^{-1}(\eta) \cap \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. Assume that $\pi(1) = \lambda - \alpha + n'\delta$, with $\alpha \in a_0^{-1}\overset{\circ}{Q}_+$ and $n' \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$. Then, as in (4.2.5), we have $\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) = \pi + \pi_{(n-n')\delta}$. By the argument used to show (4.2.10) above, we can show that $\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) = \pi + \pi_{(n-n')\delta} \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + (n - n')\delta)$. Therefore, if the element $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ satisfies condition (C) (i.e., that $n' - n \in d_\lambda\mathbb{Z}$), then it follows from Lemma 4.2.1 that $\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + (n - n')\delta) = \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. Conversely, if $\Theta(\eta \otimes z^n) \in \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$, then we obtain that $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda + (n - n')\delta) = \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$, and hence that $n - n' \in d_\lambda\mathbb{Z}$ by Lemma 4.2.1. Therefore, the element $\eta \otimes z^n \in \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ satisfies condition (C). This completes the proof of the corollary. □

A Appendix.

A.1 Relation with the crystal base of an extremal weight module. For an integral weight $\lambda \in P$, we denote by $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ the crystal base of the extremal weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V(\lambda)$ of extremal weight λ (see [Kas3, Sections 3 and 5]), where $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is the quantized universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, and denote by $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ the extremal element of weight λ corresponding to the canonical generator of $V(\lambda)$. The aim in the Appendix is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition A.1.1. *Let* $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$*, with* $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *for* $i \in I_0$*, be a level-zero dominant integral weight. Then, the crystal base* $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ *is isomorphic as a* P*-crystal to the crystal* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ *of all LS paths of shape* λ *if and only if* λ *is of the form* $m_i\varpi_i$ *for some* $i \in I_0$*.*

The main ingredient in our proof of Proposition A.1.1 is the following theorem (see [BN, Remark 4.17], and also [Kas3, Conjecture 13.1 (iii)]).

Theorem A.1.2. *Let* $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$*, with* $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *for* $i \in I_0$*, be a level-zero dominant integral weight. Then, there exists an isomorphism of* P*-crystals* $\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{B}(m_i\varpi_i)$ *that maps* $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ *to* $\widetilde{u}_\lambda := \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} u_{m_i\varpi_i} \in \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{B}(m_i\varpi_i)$*.*

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the crystal base of an extremal weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module, or a tensor product of the crystal bases of extremal weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules. Then we have an action, denoted by S_w, $w \in W$, of the Weyl group W on the set $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathrm{wt}(S_w b) = w\,\mathrm{wt}(b)$ for every $w \in W$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ (see [Kas1, Section 7]). The proof of the following lemma is standard (see the proof of [AK, Lemma 1.6 (1)]).

Lemma A.1.3. *Let* $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, *with* $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *for* $i \in I_0$, *be a level-zero dominant integral weight. For every* $w \in W$, *we have* $S_w \widetilde{u}_\lambda = \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} S_w u_{m_i \varpi_i}$.

Lemma A.1.4. *Let* $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \varpi_i$, *with* $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ *for* $i \in I_0$, *be a level-zero dominant integral weight. Then each connected component of* $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ *contains at most one element of weight* λ.

Proof. Take an arbitrary connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, and denote it by $\mathbb{B}_1(\lambda)$. We know from Theorem 3.1.1 (2) that $\mathbb{B}_1(\lambda)$ contains a unique (extremal) LS path π of shape λ having an expression of the form (3.1.4):

$$\pi = (\lambda - N_1\delta,\ \ldots,\ \lambda - N_{s-1}\delta,\ \lambda\ ;\ \tau_0,\ \tau_1,\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s-1},\ \tau_s) \in \mathbb{B}_1(\lambda).$$

Define a path $\psi \in \mathbb{P}$ by:

$$\psi = (N_1\delta,\ \ldots,\ N_{s-1}\delta,\ 0\ ;\ \tau_0,\ \tau_1,\ \ldots,\ \tau_{s-1},\ \tau_s),$$

and $n_1 \in a_0^{-1}\mathbb{Z}$ by: $\psi(1) = n_1\delta$. Then we deduce from Lemma 2.7.1 that $\mathbb{B}_1(\lambda) = \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda) - \psi$. Therefore, the number of elements of weight λ in $\mathbb{B}_1(\lambda)$ is equal to the number of elements of weight $\lambda + n_1\delta$ in $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$. But, we see from Theorem 2.6.6 (3) and the definition of the P-crystal $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ that the number of elements of weight $\lambda + n_1\delta$ in $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ is exactly 1. Hence it follows from Theorem 4.2.2 that the number of elements of weight $\lambda + n_1\delta$ in $\mathbb{B}_0(\lambda)$ is at most 1. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Proposition A.1.1. We proved in [NS2, Corollary 3.8.1] that for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $i \in I_0$, the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(m\varpi_i)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{B}(m\varpi_i)$ as a P-crystal. Therefore, it suffices to show the "only if" part. Assume that the support $\mathrm{Supp}(\lambda)$ of λ contains at least two elements, i.e., that $\#\,\mathrm{Supp}(\lambda) \geq 2$. Let us denote by $\mathcal{B}_0(\lambda)$ the connected component of $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ containing u_λ. Note that under the isomorphism of P-crystals in Theorem A.1.2, $\mathcal{B}_0(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to the connected component of $\bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{B}(m_i\varpi_i)$ containing $\widetilde{u}_\lambda := \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} u_{m_i\varpi_i}$, which we denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(\lambda)$.

Claim. *The number of elements of weight* λ *in* $\mathcal{B}_0(\lambda)$ *is greater than or equal to* 2.

Because $\# \operatorname{Supp}(\lambda) \geq 2$, we can take $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \Gamma$ such that $(\lambda, \beta_1) = (\lambda, \beta_2) = 0$ and such that $(\varpi_{i_0}, \beta_1) \neq (\varpi_{i_0}, \beta_2)$ for some $i_0 \in I_0$ with $m_{i_0} > 0$. We see from Lemma A.1.3 that

$$S_{t_{\beta_1}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda = \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} S_{t_{\beta_1}} u_{m_i \varpi_i}, \qquad S_{t_{\beta_2}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda = \bigotimes_{i \in I_0} S_{t_{\beta_2}} u_{m_i \varpi_i}.$$

Since $(\lambda, \beta_1) = (\lambda, \beta_2) = 0$, it immediately follows that both of the elements $S_{t_{\beta_1}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda$ and $S_{t_{\beta_2}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda$ are of weight λ. Note that the weight of the i_0-th factor $S_{t_{\beta_1}} u_{m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0}}$ of $S_{t_{\beta_1}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda$ equals $m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0} - m_{i_0}(\varpi_{i_0}, \beta_1)\delta$, and the weight of the i_0-th factor $S_{t_{\beta_2}} u_{m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0}}$ of $S_{t_{\beta_2}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda$ equals $m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0} - m_{i_0}(\varpi_{i_0}, \beta_2)\delta$. But, since $(\varpi_{i_0}, \beta_1) \neq (\varpi_{i_0}, \beta_2)$, the weight of $S_{t_{\beta_1}} u_{m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0}}$ is not equal to that of $S_{t_{\beta_2}} u_{m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0}}$. This implies that $S_{t_{\beta_1}} u_{m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0}} \neq S_{t_{\beta_2}} u_{m_{i_0} \varpi_{i_0}}$, and hence that $S_{t_{\beta_1}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda \neq S_{t_{\beta_2}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda$. Because both of the elements $S_{t_{\beta_1}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda$ and $S_{t_{\beta_2}} \widetilde{u}_\lambda$ lie in the connected component $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(\lambda)$ of $\bigotimes_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{B}(m_i \varpi_i)$ containing $\widetilde{u}_\lambda$, we conclude that the number of elements of weight λ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(\lambda)$ is greater than or equal to 2. Hence the same is true for the connected component $\mathcal{B}_0(\lambda)$ of $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, since $\mathcal{B}_0(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_0(\lambda)$ as a P-crystal. This proves the claim.

Now suppose that the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ as a P-crystal. Then the connected component $\mathcal{B}_0(\lambda)$ of $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is isomorphic as a P-crystal to some connected component of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$; denote it by $\mathbb{B}_1(\lambda)$ as in the proof of Lemma A.1.4. We know from Lemma A.1.4 that the number of elements of weight λ in $\mathbb{B}_1(\lambda)$ is at most 1. Hence we deduce that the number of elements of weight λ in $\mathcal{B}_0(\lambda)$ is at most 1, which contradicts the claim above. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

Example A.1.5. Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is nontwisted, and $\lambda \in P$ is of the form $\sum_{i \in J} \varpi_i$, with $J \subset I_0$ and $\# J \geq 2$. Note that in this case, $d_i = 1$ for all $i \in I_0$ by Remark 2.1.1 (1) and (2.3.1). We know from [Kas3, Proposition 5.4 (ii)] that the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is connected. Also, we see from Theorem 3.1.1 that the crystal $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ is connected, since $\operatorname{Supp}_{\geq 2}(\lambda) = \emptyset$ and hence $\operatorname{Turn}(\lambda) = \emptyset$. However, the crystals $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ and $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ are not isomorphic, as can be seen from Proposition A.1.1. Let us study this case more precisely.

We know from Theorem A.1.2 that $\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \cong \bigotimes_{i \in J} \mathcal{B}(\varpi_i)$ as P-crystals. In addition, we know from [NS2, Corollary 2.2.1] that for each $i \in I_0$, the crystal base $\mathcal{B}(\varpi_i)$ is isomorphic as a P-crystal to $\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i) = \mathbb{B}_0(\varpi_i)$, which in turn is isomorphic to the affinization $\widehat{\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}}$ of the P_{cl}-crystal $\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}$ by Theorem 4.2.2 (note that $d_{\varpi_i} = 1$). Hence we have

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \cong \bigotimes_{i \in J} \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}}} = \bigotimes_{i \in J} \bigl(\mathcal{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}} \times \mathbb{Z}\bigr) \quad \text{as } P\text{-crystals.} \tag{A.1.1}$$

Now, in our case, $d_\lambda = 1$ since by Remark 4.1.1 it is equal to the greatest common divisor of $\{m_i d_i\}_{i \in I_0} = \{m_i\}_{i \in I_0}$ with $m_i = 0, 1$ for $i \in I_0$. Hence it follows from Theorem 4.2.2 and the connectedness of $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$, along with Theorem 2.6.6, that

$$\mathbb{B}(\lambda) = \mathbb{B}_0(\lambda) \cong \widehat{\mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}}} = \mathbb{B}(\lambda)_{\mathrm{cl}} \times \mathbb{Z} \cong \left(\bigotimes_{i \in J} \mathbb{B}(\varpi_i)_{\mathrm{cl}} \right) \times \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{as } P\text{-crystals}. \qquad (\mathrm{A}.1.2)$$

The observations (A.1.1) and (A.1.2) above illustrate how the P-crystals $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ and $\mathbb{B}(\lambda)$ differ.

References

[AK] T. Akasaka and M. Kashiwara, Finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **33** (1997), 839–867.

[BN] J. Beck and H. Nakajima, Crystal bases and two-sided cells of quantum affine algebras, *Duke Math. J.* **123** (2004), 335–402.

[GL] J. Greenstein and P. Lamprou, Path model for quantum loop modules of fundamental type, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2004**, no.14, 675–711.

[HK] J. Hong and S.-J. Kang, “Introduction to quantum groups and crystal bases”, Graduate Studies in Mathematics Vol. 42, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.

[J] A. Joseph, “Quantum Groups and Their Primitive Ideals”, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete Vol. 29, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

[Kac] V. G. Kac, “Infinite Dimensional Lie Algebras”, 3rd Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1990.

[Kas1] M. Kashiwara, Crystal bases of modified quantized enveloping algebra, *Duke Math. J.* **73** (1994), 383–413.

[Kas2] M. Kashiwara, Similarity of crystal bases, *in* “Lie Algebras and Their Representations” (S.-J. Kang et al., Eds.), Contemp. Math. Vol. 194, pp. 177–186, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.

[Kas3] M. Kashiwara, On level-zero representations of quantized affine algebras, *Duke Math. J.* **112** (2002), 117–175.

[L1] P. Littelmann, A Littlewood–Richardson rule for symmetrizable Kac–Moody algebras, *Invent. Math.* **116** (1994), 329–346.

[L2] P. Littelmann, Paths and root operators in representation theory, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **142** (1995), 499–525.

[NS1] S. Naito and D. Sagaki, Path model for a level-zero extremal weight module over a quantum affine algebra, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2003**, no.32, 1731–1754.

[NS2] S. Naito and D. Sagaki, Path model for a level-zero extremal weight module over a quantum affine algebra. II, to appear in *Adv. Math.*

[NS3] S. Naito and D. Sagaki, Crystal of Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths associated to an integral weight of level zero for an affine Lie algebra, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2005**, no.14, 815–840.